This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BL
80
.A19

THE

RELIGIOUS WORLD

DISPLAYED;

OR,

A VIEW

OF THE

FOUR GRAND SYSTEMS OF RELIGION,
JUDAISM, PAGANISM, CHRISTIANITY,
AND MOHAMMEDISM;

AND OF THE

VARIOUS EXISTING DENOMINATIONS, SECTS AND PARTIES, IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

TO WHICH IS SUBJOINED,

A VIEW OF

DEISM AND ATHEISM.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

BY THE

REV. ROBERT ADAM, B. A. OXFORD;

MINISTER OF THE EPISCOPAL CONGREGATION, BLACKFRIAR'S WYND, EDINBURGH; AND CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF KELLIE.

Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.
1 THESSAL. 5. v. 21.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by James Ballantyne and Co.

FOR LONGMAN, HURST, REES, AND ORME, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON;
AND SOLD BY WILLIAM LAING, JOHN ANDERSON AND S. CHEYNE, EDINBURGH.

1809.

BL
60
.A19

"We have, I verily believe, in our country, the best establishment of Christianity, in doctrine and discipline, and the most conducive to every good purpose of society; but yet it behoves us to look impartially into the different controversies and opinions, and Confessions of Faith."—Archbishop DRUMMOND's *Letter on Theol. Study*, subjoined to his *Sermons*, 8vo. 1803.

Gift
Tappan Pub. Assn.
1-13-1933

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME SECOND.

PAGE.

** Church of Rome, and Roman Catholics 1
Protestantism and Protestants 81
Prevailing Doctrines in regard to the object of Divine Worship, &c. 99
* Trinitarianism, Trinitarians and Athanasians 101
Sabellianism and Sabellians 115
Arianism and Arians 123
Unitarianism and Unitarians 146
Materialism and Materialists 207
Necessitarianism and Necessitarians 214
* Calvinism and Calvinists 220
* Arminianism and Arminians 245
Antinomianism and Antinomians 261
* Episcopacy and Episcopalians 275
* Presbyterianism and Presbyterians 289
* Independency and Independents 306
* Lutheranism and Lutherans 321
* United Church of England and Ireland 357
* Episcopal Church in Scotland 399
Episcopal Church in America 445

ERRATA.

VOL. II.

Page 96. line 8. for *remain*, read *remains*.
148. 5. for *Samoseta*, read *Samosata*.
159. 6. of the Note, and wherever the same name occurs, for *Horseley*, read *Horsley*.
174. 3 of Note 1. for *Pivilegio*, read *Privilegio*.
178. 12. for *Carpender*, read *Carpenter*.
241. 17. for *Whitfied*, read *Whitfield*.
271. 16. for *entituled*, read *entitled*.
307. 4. of the Note, for *cætum*, read *cætum*.
365. dele the whole of Note 2, after the first line. *Corpus Christi* and *Bennet* are different names for the same College.
388. 7. for *are supposed*, read *is supposed*.
394. 12. for *piet*, read *piety*.
395. Note 2. for *those marked thus* (*) read *those followed by an asterisk*.
—— 25. after *Horne*, add *Horsley*.
436 7. of Note 2. after *James*, add *III*.
438. dele lines *fourteen* and *fifteen*.
439. line 10. for *Tunis*, read *Tanis*.
441. 4. for *Bishop Forbes*, read *Dr Forbes*.

THE

CHURCH OF ROME,

AND HER MEMBERS

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

NAMES.—By a Roman Catholic, the members of this Church understand one who, being in communion with the Pope,[1] believes every truth revealed by God, and proposed to him as such by the Church, because God, the unerring truth, has revealed them. *Popery* and *Papists* were the names by which the Roman Catholic religion and its professors were distinguished by the first reformers, and the law, in this country, designed them afterwards by the same names. But these appellations were considered by themselves as nick-

[1] ☞ For the term *Pope*, see above, Vol. I. p. 371. note.

N. B. To all the author's references and notes in the course of this and the other articles not written by himself, an index, or hand, will be prefixed, as here, to distinguish them from those of the writer of the respective articles.

names, or terms of reproach, intended to hold forth to popular odium their communion with the Pope, as the fundamental article of their religion, and to obliterate that of *Catholic*, to which they claimed an exclusive right, and by which they had always and every where been known.[1]

In law, they are now called *Roman Catholics*, as may be seen from the title of the acts of Parliament passed in their favour at different times in the end of the last century, and the oaths of allegiance prescribed to them by the same, one of which will be found below.

Rise, Progress, &c.—It is impossible to compress any satisfactory history of this religion, within the narrow limits which must be assign-

[1] ☞ Many readers will no doubt be apt to hesitate in regard to this and various other assertions and opinions in the course of this article; but the author does not conceive it to be so much his province to controvert what may be advanced by those who have thus taken the trouble of writing an account of their own church or denomination for insertion here, as to add such remarks and references as he shall judge necessary for further illustration, and with a view more effectually to promote the object of his work. He would, therefore, observe here, that, in the strict sense of the word, there is *no Catholic Church* in being, *i. e.* no *Universal Christian Communion;* and therefore, when, in rehearsing the Apostles' Creed, we profess to believe in *the Holy Catholic Church*, we must mean, as Mr Chillingworth expresses it, "the right that the Church of Christ, or rather, to speak properly, the *Gospel* of Christ, hath to be universally believed. And therefore the article may be true, though there were no Christian Church in the world." Mr Chillingworth's *Works*, Fol. p. 196.

ed to it, in a work of this nature: it is blended and intimately connected with the history of every civilized kingdom in the world; and there has been no nation as yet, since the apostolic age, converted from infidelity to Christianity, which has not been brought to the light of faith by men, either sent by the Pope of Rome for that purpose, or in communion with him. Witness, in the second age, the great conversions in Africa, Gaul, and Britain, by missionaries from Rome;[1] in the third, the conversions of the Goths,[2] and of the Æthiopians and Iberians in the fourth;[3] in the 5th age, St. Palladius sent by Pope Celestine,[4] converted the Scots, and St. Patrick sent by the same,[5] converted the Irish, and the Saints Remigius and Vedastus, the French. St. Ninianus in the 6th century, converted the Southern,[6] and St Columba the Northern Picts,[7] St Rupert the Bavarians, St. Columbanus and St. Gallus, the Swabians;[8] and St. Augustin, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, brought over to the Christian faith, the English Saxon King Ethelbert with his people.[9]

[1] Innoc. I. *Ep. ad Victr.* Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* c. iv. and c. iii.

[2] Sozomen, b. 2. c. vi. Philostorg. b. 2. c. v. St. Basil *Ep.* 338. See BUTLER's note on St. Sabas the Goth.

[3] See BUTL. *Life of St Frumentius*, Ap. of Æthiopia.

[4] St. PROS. *adv. Coll. Cent. of Mag.* Cent. 5.

[5] Idem. Cent. 5 and 6. [6] *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. iv.

[7] *Bed.* ibid.

[8] *Heyl. Cosm.* p. 431. *Atlas. Geog.* vol. i.

[9] *Bed. Hist.* l. 1. c. xxv. xxvi.

THE

CHURCH OF ROME,

AND HER MEMBERS

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

NAMES.—By a Roman Catholic, the members of this Church understand one who, being in communion with the Pope,[1] believes every truth revealed by God, and proposed to him as such by the Church, because God, the unerring truth, has revealed them. *Popery* and *Papists* were the names by which the Roman Catholic religion and its professors were distinguished by the first reformers, and the law, in this country, designed them afterwards by the same names. But these appellations were considered by themselves as nick-

[1] ☞ For the term *Pope*, see above, Vol. I. p. 371. note.

N. B. To all the author's references and notes in the course of this and the other articles not written by himself, an index, or hand, will be prefixed, as here, to distinguish them from those of the writer of the respective articles.

names, or terms of reproach, intended to hold forth to popular odium their communion with the Pope, as the fundamental article of their religion, and to obliterate that of *Catholic*, to which they claimed an exclusive right, and by which they had always and every where been known.[1]

In law, they are now called *Roman Catholics*, as may be seen from the title of the acts of Parliament passed in their favour at different times in the end of the last century, and the oaths of allegiance prescribed to them by the same, one of which will be found below.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—It is impossible to compress any satisfactory history of this religion, within the narrow limits which must be assign-

[1] ☞ Many readers will no doubt be apt to hesitate in regard to this and various other assertions and opinions in the course of this article; but the author does not conceive it to be so much his province to controvert what may be advanced by those who have thus taken the trouble of writing an account of their own church or denomination for insertion here, as to add such remarks and references as he shall judge necessary for further illustration, and with a view more effectually to promote the object of his work. He would, therefore, observe here, that, in the strict sense of the word, there is *no Catholic Church* in being, *i. e.* no *Universal Christian Communion*; and therefore, when, in rehearsing the Apostles' Creed, we profess to believe in *the Holy Catholic Church*, we must mean, as Mr Chillingworth expresses it, "the right that the Church of Christ, or rather, to speak properly, the *Gospel* of Christ, hath to be universally believed. And therefore the article may be true, though there were no Christian Church in the world." Mr CHILLINGWORTH'S *Works*, Fol. p. 196.

ed to it, in a work of this nature: it is blended and intimately connected with the history of every civilized kingdom in the world; and there has been no nation as yet, since the apostolic age, converted from infidelity to Christianity, which has not been brought to the light of faith by men, either sent by the Pope of Rome for that purpose, or in communion with him. Witness, in the second age, the great conversions in Africa, Gaul, and Britain, by missionaries from Rome;[1] in the third, the conversions of the Goths,[2] and of the Æthiopians and Iberians in the fourth;[3] in the 5th age, St. Palladius sent by Pope Celestine,[4] converted the Scots, and St. Patrick sent by the same,[5] converted the Irish, and the Saints Remigius and Vedastus, the French. St. Ninianus in the 6th century, converted the Southern,[6] and St Columba the Northern Picts,[7] St Rupert the Bavarians, St. Columbanus and St. Gallus, the Swabians;[8] and St. Augustin, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, brought over to the Christian faith, the English Saxon King Ethelbert with his people.[9]

[1] Innoc. I. *Ep. ad Victr.* Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* c. iv. and c. iii.

[2] Sozomen, b. 2. c. vi. Philostorg. b. 2. c. v. St. Basil *Ep.* 338. See BUTLER's note on St. Sabas the Goth.

[3] See BUTL. *Life of St Frumentius*, Ap. of Æthiopia.

[4] St. PROS. *adv. Coll. Cent. of Mag.* Cent. 5.

[5] Idem. Cent. 5 and 6. [6] *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. iv.

[7] *Bed.* ibid.

[8] *Heyl. Cosm.* p. 431. *Atlas. Geog.* vol. i.

[9] *Bed. Hist.* l. 1. c. xxv. xxvi.

In the 7th century, the East Angles were converted by St. Felix, and the West Saxons by St. Birinus;[1] and the Duke of Franconia with his people by St. Kilianus, who was sent to preach the gospel by Pope Conon.[2] St. Boniface, ordained and sent by Pope Gregory the Second, in the 8th century converted Hesse, Thuringia, Westphalia, and Saxony;[3] and in the 9th century, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, sent by Pope Hadrian the Second,[4] brought the Sclavonians, Moravians, and Bohemians, to the light of faith, and St. Ansgarius, the people of Holstein.[5] The Danes, in the 10th century, were converted by St. Poppo,[6] the Goths in Swedeland by St. Sigifred,[7] and the Poles and Prussians in part by St. Adelbert;[8] while St. Bruno and St. Bonifacius laboured with great fruit in the conversion of the Russians of Poland, and the Muscovites were brought over to the fold of Christ by the Greeks,[9] whose patriarch at that time was joined in communion with the Church of Rome. The Icelanders, in the 11th century, were added to the Roman Catholic Church, by Olaus Trugger the Pious,[10] and the Hungarians and Norwegians converted in the

[1] See the *Lives of* St. Felix and St Birin. by Butler.

[2] *Atlas Geog.* p. 438. 2. [3] Ibid.

[4] *Mart. Pol. ad ann.* 859. *Æneas Syl. Hist. Boem.* l. 1. c. xiii. Mart. *Chrom.* de Reb. Pol. l. 3.

[5] Heyl. *Cosm.* p. 484. 501. [6] Ibid, 484.

[7] *Atlas Geog.* v. 1. p. 208. [8] Idem, p. 229. 248.

[9] Le Brun's *Dissert.* on the Liturgies, T. 2. p. 421.

[10] *Atlas Geog.* p. 145.

same century; but relapsing for the most part to their former idolatry, were about the year 1156 regained to Christianity by Pope Adrian the Fourth; and by the preaching of St. Meinardus in the 12th age, Courland, Samogitia, and Livonia, received the faith of Christ.[1] In the 13th century, Pope Innocent the Fourth sent the Dominicans to preach to the Tartars,[2] and by them and the Franciscans, in several parts of the world, many infidels received the light of faith. In the 14th century, Lithuania was converted,[3] while between that and the beginning of the next age, St. Vincent Ferrerius brought over to the Roman Catholic faith 25,000 Jews and Moors;[4] and in the 15th age, the inhabitants of the Canary Islands were brought over to Christ, and the Portuguese very successfully preached the Roman Catholic faith in the kingdoms of Congo and Angola.[5] St. Francis Xavier, in the 16th century, sent by Pope Paul the Third, and carrying the light of the gospel to the coasts of Malabar, Travancore, and the Pearl Fishery in the East Indies, to the Molucca, Del Moro, and Japan Islands, by his preaching and miracles,[6] brought many hun-

[1] Heylin, p. 524. *Atlas Geog.* p. 262, 263.
[2] Vincent. l. 9. [3] Heyl. *Cos.* p. 524.
[4] St. Antonin. 3. Part. Hist. Tit. 23. c. viii. § 4.
[5] Heyl. *Cos.* p. 996. 998.
[6] ☞ Van Dale, Moyle, Le Clerk, and others, reject all miracles after the apostolical age, or consider them as very doubtful; most Protestants, I believe, look upon them as extremely suspicious, after Constantine, with perhaps the excep-

dred thousands to the Roman Catholic faith;[1] and the Spaniards preached Christ to the infidels of the Philippine Islands with no less success.[2] And Martinus a Valentia, a preacher of the order of St. Francis, with twelve companions in the empire of Mexico, in the course of seven years, baptized upwards of a million of infidels;[3] while St. Lewis Bertrand, a Dominican friar, famous for sanctity and miracles, according to the history of his time, converted an innumerable multitude of barbarians in the southern continent of America,[4] insomuch, that the inhabitants of Terra Firma, of New Granada, of New Andalusia, of Popayan, and of Peru, are, in a manner, all Christians; and the Jesuits planted the Roman Catholic faith in Brazil and Paraguay. By the zealous labours of Roman Catholic missionaries in the last century, in several parts of Asia, as in China, the kingdoms of Tonquin, of Cochin China, of Madure, and of Thibet, and the Marian Islands, there have been great numbers brought over to the Roman Catholic faith, as well as in North Ameri-

tion of Julian's defeat in his attempt to rebuild the temple; and St. Chrysostom observes, that "there were no footsteps of the power of miracles left in the church in his time."—*De Sacerd.* L. 4. See Bishop DOUGLASS's *Criterion of Miracles.*

[1] See the Saint's Life by *Butler.*

[2] *Lettres Edifiantes*, &c. Recueil XI. Let. 3.

[3] Thom. a Jesu *de Conv. Om. Gent.* l. 4. c. v.

[4] See his Life by *Butler.*

THE

CHURCH OF ROME,

AND HER MEMBERS

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

NAMES.—By a Roman Catholic, the members of this Church understand one who, being in communion with the Pope,[1] believes every truth revealed by God, and proposed to him as such by the Church, because God, the unerring truth, has revealed them. *Popery* and *Papists* were the names by which the Roman Catholic religion and its professors were distinguished by the first reformers, and the law, in this country, designed them afterwards by the same names. But these appellations were considered by themselves as nick-

[1] ☞ For the term *Pope*, see above, Vol. I. p. 371. note.

N. B. To all the author's references and notes in the course of this and the other articles not written by himself, an index, or hand, will be prefixed, as here, to distinguish them from those of the writer of the respective articles.

names, or terms of reproach, intended to hold forth to popular odium their communion with the Pope, as the fundamental article of their religion, and to obliterate that of *Catholic*, to which they claimed an exclusive right, and by which they had always and every where been known.[1]

In law, they are now called *Roman Catholics*, as may be seen from the title of the acts of Parliament passed in their favour at different times in the end of the last century, and the oaths of allegiance prescribed to them by the same, one of which will be found below.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—It is impossible to compress any satisfactory history of this religion, within the narrow limits which must be assign-

[1] ☞ Many readers will no doubt be apt to hesitate in regard to this and various other assertions and opinions in the course of this article; but the author does not conceive it to be so much his province to controvert what may be advanced by those who have thus taken the trouble of writing an account of their own church or denomination for insertion here, as to add such remarks and references as he shall judge necessary for further illustration, and with a view more effectually to promote the object of his work. He would, therefore, observe here, that, in the strict sense of the word, there is *no Catholic Church* in being, *i. e.* no *Universal Christian Communion*; and therefore, when, in rehearsing the Apostles' Creed, we profess to believe in *the Holy Catholic Church*, we must mean, as Mr Chillingworth expresses it, "the right that the Church of Christ, or rather, to speak properly, the *Gospel* of Christ, hath to be universally believed. And therefore the article may be true, though there were no Christian Church in the world." Mr CHILLINGWORTH's *Works*, Fol. p. 196.

ed to it, in a work of this nature: it is blended and intimately connected with the history of every civilized kingdom in the world; and there has been no nation as yet, since the apostolic age, converted from infidelity to Christianity, which has not been brought to the light of faith by men, either sent by the Pope of Rome for that purpose, or in communion with him. Witness, in the second age, the great conversions in Africa, Gaul, and Britain, by missionaries from Rome;[1] in the third, the conversions of the Goths,[2] and of the Æthiopians and Iberians in the fourth;[3] in the 5th age, St. Palladius sent by Pope Celestine,[4] converted the Scots, and St. Patrick sent by the same,[5] converted the Irish, and the Saints Remigius and Vedastus, the French. St. Ninianus in the 6th century, converted the Southern,[6] and St Columba the Northern Picts,[7] St Rupert the Bavarians, St. Columbanus and St. Gallus, the Swabians;[8] and St. Augustin, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, brought over to the Christian faith, the English Saxon King Ethelbert with his people.[9]

[1] Innoc. I. *Ep. ad Victr.* Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* c. iv. and c. iii.

[2] Sozomen, b. 2. c. vi. Philostorg. b. 2. c. v. St. Basil *Ep.* 338. See BUTLER'S note on St. Sabas the Goth.

[3] See BUTL. *Life of St Frumentius*, Ap. of Æthiopia.

[4] St. PROS. *adv. Coll. Cent. of Mag.* Cent. 5.

[5] Idem. Cent. 5 and 6. [6] *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. iv.

[7] *Bed.* ibid.

[8] *Heyl. Cosm.* p. 431. *Atlas. Geog.* vol. i.

[9] *Bed. Hist.* l. 1. c. xxv. xxvi.

names, or terms of reproach, intended to hold forth to popular odium their communion with the Pope, as the fundamental article of their religion, and to obliterate that of *Catholic*, to which they claimed an exclusive right, and by which they had always and every where been known.[1]

In law, they are now called *Roman Catholics*, as may be seen from the title of the acts of Parliament passed in their favour at different times in the end of the last century, and the oaths of allegiance prescribed to them by the same, one of which will be found below.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—It is impossible to compress any satisfactory history of this religion, within the narrow limits which must be assign-

[1] ☞ Many readers will no doubt be apt to hesitate in regard to this and various other assertions and opinions in the course of this article; but the author does not conceive it to be so much his province to controvert what may be advanced by those who have thus taken the trouble of writing an account of their own church or denomination for insertion here, as to add such remarks and references as he shall judge necessary for further illustration, and with a view more effectually to promote the object of his work. He would, therefore, observe here, that, in the strict sense of the word, there is *no Catholic Church* in being, *i. e.* no *Universal Christian Communion;* and therefore, when, in rehearsing the Apostles' Creed, we profess to believe in *the Holy Catholic Church*, we must mean, as Mr Chillingworth expresses it, "the right that the Church of Christ, or rather, to speak properly, the *Gospel* of Christ, hath to be universally believed. And therefore the article may be true, though there were no Christian Church in the world." Mr CHILLINGWORTH'S *Works*, Fol. p. 196.

ed to it, in a work of this nature: it is blended and intimately connected with the history of every civilized kingdom in the world; and there has been no nation as yet, since the apostolic age, converted from infidelity to Christianity, which has not been brought to the light of faith by men, either sent by the Pope of Rome for that purpose, or in communion with him. Witness, in the second age, the great conversions in Africa, Gaul, and Britain, by missionaries from Rome;[1] in the third, the conversions of the Goths,[2] and of the Æthiopians and Iberians in the fourth;[3] in the 5th age, St. Palladius sent by Pope Celestine,[4] converted the Scots, and St. Patrick sent by the same,[5] converted the Irish, and the Saints Remigius and Vedastus, the French. St. Ninianus in the 6th century, converted the Southern,[6] and St Columba the Northern Picts,[7] St Rupert the Bavarians, St. Columbanus and St. Gallus, the Swabians;[8] and St. Augustin, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, brought over to the Christian faith, the English Saxon King Ethelbert with his people.[9]

[1] Innoc. I. *Ep. ad Victr.* Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* c. iv. and c. iii.

[2] Sozomen, b. 2. c. vi. Philostorg. b. 2. c. v. St. Basil *Ep.* 338. See BUTLER's note on St. Sabas the Goth.

[3] See BUTL. *Life of St Frumentius*, Ap. of Æthiopia.

[4] St. PROS. *adv. Coll. Cent. of Mag.* Cent. 5.

[5] Idem. Cent. 5 and 6.

[6] *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. iv.

[7] *Bed.* ibid.

[8] *Heyl. Cosm.* p. 431. *Atlas. Geog.* vol. i.

[9] *Bed. Hist.* l. 1. c. xxv. xxvi.

17. I profess likewise, that in the *Mass*,[1] there is offered to God, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion, the Catholic Church calls *transubstantiation.*

18. I also confess, that under either *kind alone*, Christ whole and entire, and a true sacrament, is received.

19. I constantly hold that there is a *purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained, are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.——

20. Likewise, that the *saints* reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

[1] The *Missa*, or mass, of the ancient church, was a general name for the whole of divine service; but the members of the Church of Rome, now understand by this word, the office, or prayers, used at the celebration of the Eucharist; or, in other words, the consecrating of the bread and wine, whereby they become, according to their doctrine, the very and substantial body and blood of Christ; and the offering of them, so transubstantiated, as an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. The ceremonies of the mass consist of 35 different actions, all meant to allude to particular circumstances in our Lord's passion. See *Explicat. des Cerem. de la Messe*, or Broughton's *Histor. Libr.* under the *Art.* Mass.

21. I most firmly assert, that the *images* of Christ, of the mother of God ever virgin, and also of the other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given them.

22. I also affirm, that the power of *indulgences* was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

23. I acknowledge the holy, Catholic, Apostolic *Roman* Church, for the *mother* and *mistress* of all Churches;[1] and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

24. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred *canons* and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of *Trent*: and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

I, the same N. promise, vow, and swear, through God's help, to hold and confess most constantly, to my last breath, this true Catholic faith, entire and inviolable, which at present I willingly profess and truly hold, and out of which none can be saved; and that I will take care, in as far as I can, that the same shall be held, taught, and professed by those who are under me, or of

[1] ☞ See above, Vol. I. p. 295.

whom I shall have charge by my office. So help me God, and these Gospels of God. Amen.[1]"

To this creed, rightly understood, every Roman Catholic assents, and by it, makes a profession of his faith; but as many take the liberty of attributing doctrines to them which they disavow, I shall here point out how they themselves understand what may appear to have most difficulty in this symbol. With them, nothing is to be believed by *divine faith* but what God revealed; and according to them, an article of divine Catholic faith is, *that*, and *only that, which has been revealed by God to his prophets, apostles, or other inspired writers of the Scriptures, and is proposed as such to her Children by the Church.*

But whether this is proposed to them by the universal church, as the word of God *preached* by an apostle, or as the word of God *written* by an apostle, is a matter of indifference to a Roman Catholic; he believes the one with divine faith, as well as the other; as the first Christians believed the revealed doctrines of Christ with equal firmness before they were written, as they did after they were written. The first is, what Roman Catholics understand by *the word of God*, deli-

[1] ☞ The University of Oxford, or the delegates of the University press, speaking of this Creed in the preface to the *Sylloge Confessionum*, printed at Oxford in 1804, use these words, "Professio Tridentina, aperta certè et simplex, sine ulla tergiversatione ea exhibet dogmata, in quibus post exhaustas fere cum Reformatoribus controversias subsedit Ecclesia Romana."

vered to the church from the beginning, and handed down to us from age to age *by tradition*; the second is, *the word of God* delivered to the church, and handed down to us from age to age *by scripture*: and as they believe that the scripture contains the word of God, *because it has been so taught, preached, believed, and delivered successively by the church in all ages*, without one text of scripture to prove the same; so, whatever thing the same church dispersed throughout the world, has in all ages successively, without interruption, taught, preached, believed, and delivered, as the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, a Roman Catholic believes that by divine faith.

But every other law, or constitution of the church, although it were a constitution or ordinance of the Apostles, handed down to our time by tradition, such as the keeping holy Sunday, instead of Saturday, as commanded in Scripture, however *true* and *just* they may be in themselves, yet not being revealed by God, they are not objects of *divine faith*; and what their faith teaches concerning these is, that they are to obey their spiritual superiors, and the church, and observe her just ordinances. To understand, therefore, rightly, not only this Creed, but likewise the definitions of their general councils, it is necessary to bring the foregoing observations always along with us.

They believe the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and as such, have the highest veneration for them, and

own them to be of the greatest authority upon earth, leading infallibly to truth, when *rightly understood;* but finding, by the experience of so many heresies since our Saviour's time, all pretending to be grounded on scripture, many parts of the word of God, even those that concern the most fundamental articles of the Christian religion, interpreted several ways, and made to signify things contradictory; the Roman Catholic does not presume to follow his own interpretation of any texts in it, contrary to the way they have been understood by the universal church in all ages since the apostles, however well grounded his own private sentiments may appear to him. For, as none but the universal church could with certainty tell him what books she received from the apostles, as containing the word of God; so he believes none but the universal church can point out to him, with certainty, in what sense the same word of God was delivered to her by the apostles, when a contest arises about the meaning of it; and to guard himself against error, he professes in this Creed, not to interpret it *otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers* in all ages.

By a *Sacrament*, they mean an external sign, or ceremony, instituted by Jesus Christ, to convey grace to the soul of the worthy receiver.

Baptism, the first of their sacraments, they hold to be the means appointed by our Lord to deliver us from original sin, make us children of God, and members of his church, and entitle us to

eternal happiness. They believe it absolutely necessary for salvation, either *actually*, when it can be had, or *in desire*, when it cannot; and providing the due matter and form are used for that purpose, they hold it to be always valid and, in case of necessity, lawful, by whomsoever it is administered.

By *Confirmation*, according to their belief, the baptized person receives the Holy Ghost to confirm him in, and enable him to profess, the faith of Christ, and make him a perfect Christian.

They firmly believe, that in the sacrament of the *Eucharist*, there is really, truly, and substantially, the body and blood, with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; and that, by consecration, the substance of bread is converted into his body, and the substance of the wine into his blood; the external qualities of both bread and wine still remaining the same. This conversion, or *transubstantiation*, implies, that after consecration, the substance of the body of Christ is really under the appearance of bread, and that the substance of bread ceases to be there; in like manner, that the substance of the blood of Christ is really under the appearance of wine, and that the substance of the wine ceases to be there: and *they* see nothing impossible to Almighty Power to put the *glorified body* of Christ under the appearance of the bread, along with his blood, soul, and divinity, which must be with his living body by concomitance, and make the substance of the bread, at the same instant, cease to be there; no more

than they see it impossible to Almighty Power to create a world out of nothing; especially as it is not against Catholic faith to say, that the *glorified body* of Christ is a spiritual body, and that, though he is really and substantially present in the sacrament, he may be said to be there as if he were a spirit. They believe also, that under either kind alone, Christ whole and entire, and a true sacrament, is received. To understand this, observe that, according to them, the bread by consecration is really changed into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood: now as Christ is living and immortal, wherever his body is, there his blood, soul, and divinity, must be; and wherever his blood is, there also must his body, soul, and divinity be; they cannot be separated, so that Christ is received whole under each kind.

In administering this sacrament to her children, the practice of their church has varied. For the first four hundred years after Christ, it was given under one kind only,[1] or under both; in the fifth century, Pope Gelasius, with a view to detect the Manicheans, ordered it to be received, under both; and for several centuries past, it is received under one only; this being a point they believe, not of faith, but of discipline, which is variable according to the exigencies of the times.

They believe, that *by the Sacrament of Penance*,

[1] Tertull. l. 2. c. 5. ad. Uxor. p. 169. edit. Rigaltii Paris, 1675. Clem. Alexand. l. 1. Strom. sub initio. Euseb. Hist. l. 6. c. 44. p. 318. ed. Valesii Cantab. 1720. Paulin. in vita S. Ambros. n. 47. Amphiloch. in vita S. Basilii. S. Aug. l. 49. *de consen.* Evang.

a priest, duly qualified to administer it, can forgive one his sins, *providing* he is sincerely sorry for them, is firmly resolved to avoid them through grace for the future, and is disposed to give satisfaction by penitential works, according to his capacity, to his offended God, and make restitution, if he can, to his injured neighbour, and confesses his sins with sincerity to his confessor. But so far are they from believing that a priest, bishop, or *Pope*, can forgive one his sins without these dispositions, that they do not believe God himself will forgive any man without them.[1]

Extreme Unction with them is a sacrament, by which a man in danger of death, duly disposed, receives grace to resist the assaults of Satan in his last moments, and to purify him from any stains or remains of sin, which may be lurking in the soul; and sometimes it procures the health of the body, when God sees that expedient for the soul.

The sacred powers of the priesthood, with grace to enable one to exercise them well, are, according to their belief, communicated by the sacrament of *Order*; and by *Matrimony*, the married couple, when properly disposed, receive grace to discharge the weighty duties of their state, and bring up their children in the fear and love of God.

[1] ☞ Having conversed with several Roman Catholic priests on this subject, all that I could learn from them, entirely harmonizes with what is here expressed. I am therefore inclined, in charity to them, to believe, that their doctrine on this head, in particular, has been misinterpreted, or much misunderstood; and that it does not countenance them in extending their powers beyond this, whatever some ignorant or designing priests in Ireland, or elsewhere, may have taught or pretended to.

The Roman Catholic Church always made use of ceremonies in the administration of the sacraments, for the greater decency and majesty of religion, and to place, in a striking manner, before the faithful, the graces conferred on them by these sacred symbols, and excite them to devotion; but none of these are believed by divine faith, but such as have been from the beginning revealed.

They believe that sin is forgiven *gratis* by divine mercy, for the sake of Jesus Christ; that original sin is taken away entirely in baptism by grace; that in justification, the sins are really washed away, and the soul rendered truly just and holy, before God: and that we owe to the pure mercy of God, the justice which is in us by the Holy Ghost; and that all the good works conducive to eternal salvation, which we do, are so many gifts of the grace of God.

They believe also, that a temporal punishment is often due for our sins, after the sins themselves have been remitted by the sacrament of penance. To redeem this debt, as well as to preserve the penitent from relapsing into his sins, the confessor imposes a suitable penance, such as fasting, prayers, alms, &c. in the sacrament of confession; and Roman Catholics believe, that a just man, by such works, either enjoined him as a penance, or undertaken and performed of his own accord for that end, can, through the merits of Jesus Christ, satisfy the divine justice for temporal punishment due for sin; but their Church has not declared whether such works are satisfactory, *de congruo*,

or *de condigno*; whether they are so, because God promised to accept of them, or because he accepts of them out of benevolence: neither is it of faith, that a just man can satisfy for another, or that any works, but works of charity, or such as are done out of the motive of charity, will suffice to satisfy for the temporal punishments I have spoken of. That the just, by good works done by grace, merit eternal glory, is one of their dogmas; but we are to remember, that they believe that all these good works are the gifts of the grace of Jesus Christ; and, even by these, the Roman Catholic faith does not affirm, whether the just merit eternal glory, *ex congruo*, or *ex condigno*, or because God promised to give eternal life as a reward of our good works. Nor is it of faith that *all* the good works of the just merit eternal life. For Roman Catholic theologians dispute, whether by *charity alone*, and works done out of the motive of charity, the just merit a crown of glory, or whether they can merit it by other good works.

They constantly hold, that in the *Mass* there is offered to God, a *true*, *proper*, and *propitiatory* sacrifice for the living and the dead. The consecration and oblation of his own body and blood for the remission of sins, under the appearance of bread and wine, which Christ himself made at his last supper, and ordained that his apostles and their successors should do the like, in remembrance of him, this very thing they believe is done in mass; and they hold, that the sacrifice offered up to God by Christ upon the cross, and that offered

up to God in mass upon their altars, are the same, but different in the manner of offering. *Christ* offered himself *upon the cross* in a bloody manner for the redemption of mankind; and *Christ* offers himself *upon the altar* by the hands of his ministers, in an unbloody manner, to apply to man the fruits of the sacrifice of the cross. As Christ really shed his blood upon the cross; so, to represent the same, Christ is offered upon the altar under the separate appearance of bread and wine; this being a commemorative sacrifice, shewing forth the death of Christ until he comes. To offer up this sacrifice, as it should be, whether it be considered on the part of the priest, who officiates at the altar, or on the part of the people, who assist at mass, it is believed by them to be the sublimest act of religion man is capable of, and the highest honour they can give to God. Besides the first and *essential* end of glorifying the Supreme Being by this act, their bishops and parish priests every Sunday and holiday, offer up the sacrifice of the mass for the spiritual good of their flocks; and the people are taught to offer it up, along with their pastor, for God's glory, in thanksgiving for all his blessings, in satisfaction for their sins, and for obtaining what graces they may stand in need of: and they are told that, if with a lively faith, a contrite heart, and reverential awe, they assist at these divine mysteries, they may, through Christ, offered up for them, obtain grace, and by grace, find mercy; and in this sense, the sacrifice of the mass is propitiatory for the living. And it is so, when offered for the dead, suffering in purgatory,

by either mitigating their pains, or shortening the time of their sufferings, or releasing them entirely from them; but it is not against Catholic *faith* to say, that this sacrifice is of no service to the dead, further than it shall please God to accept of it for that end.

To preserve uniformity in the public worship of God, and to prevent the frequent changes to which the modern languages are subject, the Church allows in her liturgy only the Latin language, used by her in the western parts of the world, since the days of the Apostles, and the *Greek* and *Syro-Chaldaic*, which were used from the beginning in the Churches of the East;[1] but as this is merely a point of discipline, Pope John VIII. in the ninth century, permitted St. Methodius to use the Sclavonian language in the Liturgy of that nation,[2] lately converted to the faith, a privilege they enjoy to this day. As celebrating mass is the *office of the Priest only, addressing himself to God*, and as the people are instructed how to join him with their own prayers in offering up the sacrifice, the Church does not think, that the good arising from celebrating in the vulgar language of each country, would counterbalance the inconveniences arising from the same: she therefore, with the above exception, adheres in her Liturgy to the three languages already

[1] Vide Bonam rer. liturg. l. 1. c. v. § 4. p. 79. t. 1. et Salam. in not. ad Bonam. l. c. not. 6. p. 85. et Bonam. in Append. t. 1. p. 416. et *Dissertat.* Honorati a S. Maria, ibid.

[2] Ep. Joan. VIII. 247. t. 9. Concil. Labbe, p. 176.

mentioned, which have been used by her since the apostolic age.

Roman Catholics constantly hold, that there is a *Purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained, are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

By Purgatory, they mean a middle state of souls, who, departing this life in friendship with God, yet not without some lesser stains, or guilt of temporal punishment, suffer there, until they are perfectly cleansed from these, and have given full satisfaction to divine justice, before they can be admitted to the company of the saints and angels in heaven; but where this place is, the nature and duration of the pains suffered in it, are things with which the Roman Catholic faith has nothing to do. That the souls detained for a time in this place of purgation, are helped by the prayers, alms, and sacrifice of the mass offered for them by the faithful on earth, has been in all ages, since the Apostles, the constant belief of the Roman Catholic Church.[1]

[1] 2 Mac. xii. 43. 46. Dr Jer. Taylor, Lib. of Proph. l. 1. § 20. n. 11. p. 345. Vide all Antient Liturgies. Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. xiii. St. Cyr. Hieros. Catech. 19. n. 9. p. 328. ed. Ben. Arnob. l. 4. ad gentes. See Le Brun. Litur. Tertull. l. de Cor. c. iii. l. de Monog. c. x. S. Cypr. Ep. 1. ed. Oxon. S. Chrys. de Sacerd. l. 6. p. 424. ed Montf. Hom. 51. in 1. Cor. t. 10. p. 393. Hom. 3. in Phil. t. 11. p. 217. ed. Montf. S. Clem. Alexand. Strom. l. 7. p. 794. 865. S. August. Enchir. c. cx. De Civ. Dei, l. 21. c. xxiv. S. Ephrem. t. 2. ed. Vatic. p. 230. 236. S. Athan. Apol. ad Constant. t. 1. p. 300. Euseb. de Vita Constant. l. 4. c. lx. p. 556. and c. lxx. p. 562. c. lxxi. p. 562. S. Ambr. Orat. fun. de Theod. n. 37. t. 2. p. 1208.

Although the Roman Catholics believe, that mercy, grace, and salvation, are to be had through the merits of Jesus Christ *only*; yet they hold that it is *good and useful* to have recourse to the prayers of the saints in heaven, petitioning them *to pray to God* for them to obtain their request, as they know them to be the favourites of the great king; in the same way, that a subject wishing to get something of consequence from a most gracious sovereign, who *alone* had that in his power to give, besides his own earnest petition laid before his majesty to obtain the same, would beg also of some one of the king's favourites to intercede for him. This is what Roman Catholics mean by the invocation of Saints.[1] They also believe, that the Saints pray for them; for charity which made them pray and labour for the salvation of men on earth, they think, must spur them on to wish the same more earnestly in heaven, as charity there is made perfect. Roman Catholics firmly believe, that to give (λατρεία, or) *the worship due to God*, to *any creature whatever*, is the abominable crime of (εἰδωλολατρεία) idolatry, destructive of salvation; but, at the same time, they constantly hold, that (δουλεία) *due honour* is to be given the Saints;[2] a thing, indeed, they believe due to earthly kings, magistrates, and superiors, and instead of thinking this any ways injurious to God, they believe they would not comply with

[1] Concil. Trid. *Sess.* 25.

[2] To *worship* Christ, and *venerate* the Saints, are the words of the Council of Trent, ib.

their duty to him, if they did not give *honour to whom honour is due.*

That *a certain kind* of honour and veneration is to be given to the relics of the Saints, is a thing they likewise constantly hold. For as a Roman Catholic loves, esteems, and honours a Saint, he likewise venerates the body of the Saint, which had been the temple of the Holy Ghost, and will one day be glorified with Christ, because it is the body of the Saint: as a loving wife, who loves and honours an affectionate husband, or good and kind superior, will, after their death, respect and honour, not only their bodies, but other things belonging to them; not for any excellency which is in these things of themselves, but because they belonged to those whom she justly loved and honoured.

They most firmly assert, that the *images* of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the other Saints, are to be had and retained, and that *due* honour and veneration is to be given them. Images are a kind of books with them, which convey more instruction in a short time, even to the unlearned, than a good deal of reading will do to the learned. The sight, for instance, of an image of Christ upon the cross, dying for the love of us, will often affect a pious soul more than half an hour's reading about the same; and if the person be entirely illiterate, it may be considered at least a very useful book of instruction for him, to present to his memory what he had heard in preachings before about our Saviour's passion; and Ro-

man Catholics think this a good reason, not to mention others, for retaining images and pictures of Christ and the Saints. The honour which they give them is but a *relative* honour; they honour, for example, the image of Christ, not for any intrinsic excellency or virtue in the image itself, but for the relation it has to Christ, whom the image represents, and thus the honour is wholly given to Christ:[1] For suppose a Roman Catholic thus honouring an image, which he believes the image of Christ, but finding out, from some learned person, that it is the image of a man he knows nothing about, that moment the honour ceaseth, though the image is intrinsically the same; the reason is, he finds it is not the image of Christ; a proof it is not the image, but Christ whom he honours. In the same way, an affectionate daughter keeps with care, respect, and honour, what she got for a lock of hair, and the picture of a kind and loving father, whom death has untimely snatched away, merely because it is a relict and picture of her beloved parent; but make her once perfectly sensible, that it is a lock of hair and picture of some other man unknown to her, and the whole regard and honour is at an end.

Had the doctrine of *Indulgences*, in as far as *their faith* is concerned, been properly understood, it would not have given so much offence to so many in the sixteenth century, who began their separation from the Roman Catholic Church, by

[1] Concil. Trid. *Sess.* 25.

calling this doctrine in question. What the Church teaches concerning it is, "that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to her, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people."—By an indulgence, according to almost all theologians of her communion, is meant, a releasing the debt of temporal punishment which remains due upon account of our sins, after *the sins themselves*, as to the guilt and eternal punishment, *have been already remitted* by repentance and confession: But, according to a few of them, it means only, a releasing from the obligation of performing the penance imposed by the canons or confessor. That the Church has power to release one, in whole, or in part, from the obligation of performing the public or private penance imposed by herself, when she sees *a good and just cause for it*, is no difficult thing to believe; and that she has power to release the debt of temporal punishment due to sin, is a thing not of faith. It is true, almost all Divines think she has power, by applying Christ's superabundant satisfactions to a *just man*, to cancel the debt of temporal punishment due for his sins, in place of the satisfactions, by good works of penance, he himself should give to divine justice through the merits of Jesus Christ to redeem the said debt; but they require *a just cause* for granting an indulgence; without which, they all say, it can have no effect. The Church, however, has not declared it to be of faith, that such a power as this was left to her by Christ; but it will not fol-

low from this, that the use of indulgences cannot therefore be useful. For if they are taken in the second sense given, it must be useful for a man to be released of a burden, when circumstances concur to make that relaxation *just and desirable:* and if they are taken in the first sense, in which, indeed, they are commonly understood, they cannot but be useful. For the person who wishes to gain an indulgence in that sense, must first call to mind his sins, make a sincere act of contrition for them, firmly resolve to avoid them for the future, and apply to the sacrament of confession in hopes of pardon; and after he has good reason to believe, he has, through the merits of Jesus Christ, obtained it, he has then to say such prayers, and give such alms, or perform any other good works of penance as shall be appointed to gain the indulgence. And besides, having to do all these good works as absolutely requisite to come at the end proposed, he has also the well-grounded opinion of almost all Roman Catholic divines on his side, that he may come by this to cancel at least a great part of the temporal debt due for his sins, while he loses nothing, and is certainly greatly the gainer by the several acts of virtue he has to go through to come at the indulgence. Moreover, he is left by the Church at liberty to use, or not to use, indulgences as he pleases. He may, without them, satisfy divine justice for the temporal punishment due for his sins by penitential good works, which he is desired never to leave off while he lives, however much

he may be thought to be the gainer by indulgences; and the Council of *Trent* says, that they are to be granted *with moderation*, lest ecclesiastical *discipline* should be weakened by an overgreat facility. As to the abuses, which in the use of them had become too manifest, the Church commands her chief pastors to use proper means to put an end to them all.[1]

As they believe that Christ is in heaven the head of the Church, as well militant as triumphant; so they firmly hold, that he had appointed St. Peter under him, head of the Church on earth; and that the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, St. Peter's successor, holds the same high rank, and is possessed of a real *spiritual* superiority and authority in the Catholic Church, to keep all in the *one faith*, and conduct the faithful in the way to heaven; which spiritual superiority is perfectly distinct from the civil rights of princes and states. But that the Pope is infallible in matters of faith, when teaching the whole Church, even after he has maturely examined the scriptures and tradition, and consulted his best divines, about a point called in question, as many theologians affirm, while others deny it, is a thing which has nothing to do with the Roman Catholic faith. The Roman Catholic rule of faith is, *the word of God*, handed down to us by scripture and tradition, *as it is understood, believed, and taught by the universal Church* diffused throughout the world, or *con-*

[1] Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. *Decretum de Indulgentiis.*

vened in a General Council. To whatever point of doctrine, the universal church bears testimony, as a revealed truth, this every Roman Catholic believes by divine faith. A greater testimony, they think, even taken in a human light, cannot be desired, than the common consent of all churches throughout the world, united with their head, assuring them, that such an article is a revealed truth, handed down to them from the apostles; and taking it in a supernatural light, they know that the church is, by virtue of the divine promises, supernally assisted in preserving and teaching the truths which were originally revealed to her.

Such is the infallibility on which Roman Catholics ground their faith, and not on that of the Pope: much less do they believe that the Pope has any civil jurisdiction, power, or superiority, directly or indirectly, over any kingdom or state not his own, or that he can, upon any pretext whatsoever, absolve or dispense with the subjects of any other state or kingdom from their oath of allegiance.[1] The obe-

[1] ☞ However little dependance seems to be placed on such professions of the Roman Catholics, yet I believe it is the opinion of all those in this country, that his majesty is the lawful sovereign of all his Roman Catholic subjects, and that, by every divine and human law, they owe him true, dutiful, active, and unreserved allegiance. The formal decision of six Roman Catholic Universities on this subject, is not, perhaps, very generally known. It may therefore be observed here, that in the year 1788, a committee of the English Catholics waited on Mr Pitt, respecting their application for a repeal of the penal laws, when he requested to be furnished with authentic

dience required of them, and promised to him, in their profession of faith is, *true obedience*; that is, in things, which are neither against the laws of God, nor of one's country, and which he has a right

evidence, of the opinions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, and the Roman Catholic Universities abroad, "on the existence and extent of the Pope's dispensing power."—Three questions were accordingly framed, and sent to the Universities of *Paris*, *Louvain*, *Alcala*, *Douay*, *Salamanca*, and *Valadolid*, for their opinions. The questions proposed to them were:—

"1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, whatsoever, within the realm of England?

"2. Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

"3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

"The Universities answered unanimously,—

"1. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, has not any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England.

"2. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.

"3. That there is no principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions either of a public or a private nature."

to command. As he is, by being head of the church, the common father and pastor of all Roman Catholics; so his particular Church, the apostolic see, is acknowledged to be the mother and mistress of all Roman Catholic Churches.

By acknowledging that one receives *all* the *other things* defined by the sacred Canons and General Councils, is meant *all things* defined, regarding *faith* and *morals*, but not *all things* regarding *discipline*. The Roman Catholic Church always taught, that *without true faith, none can be saved*; and that heresy, according to St. Paul, as well as adultery unrepented of, excludes one from heaven:—and this is all that a Roman Catholic has to believe on this head.—And no Christian is thought a *heretic* by Roman Catholics, but he who *obstinately* holds an error contrary to an article of faith, and is not disposed to believe that article, although it should be pointed out to him as a revealed truth, with sufficient motives of credibility.[1]

These are the tenets which distinguish the Roman Catholics from all and every other sect of Christians whatsoever.[2] Whoever wishes to see both the dogmatic and the moral parts of Ca-

[1] S. August. Ep. 43.

[2] ☞ It deserves to be remarked under this head, that the Church of Rome receives most of the books of the *Apocrypha* as inspired and canonical Scripture; and that the only translation of the Scriptures which she acknowledges for authentic, is St Jerome's *Latin* translation of them, which is at this day in the highest degree of reputation with Roman Catholics in all countries, under the title of the *Vulgate* translation.

tholic divinity fully expounded, may consult their most esteemed theologians, and such as are commonly taught in Catholic seminaries. Among these, the incomparable *Sum*, or abridged body of divinity, of *St Thomas* of *Aquino*, has, since its first appearance, been in the highest repute with Catholics. *Honoratus Tournely*, one of the Sorbonne doctors, composed the greatest part of a course of divinity, but having died before it was complete, *Peter Collet*, a priest of the congregation of *the Mission*, continued and finished it. It is one of the clearest and most methodical bodies of theology that Catholics have, and is very justly esteemed. Collet himself wrote a body of divinity, which was commonly taught in the French seminaries before the revolution took place there. *Paul Gabriel Antoine* also, a Jesuit, published a moral, speculative, and dogmatic theology. It was the one studied in *Propaganda* College in Rome, and contains a great deal of matter in small bulk. The voluminous bodies of theology composed by *Suarez*, a Jesuit, *Sylvius* a French priest, and *Concina* a Dominican, shew them to have been very able divines. The learned Jesuit, Cardinal *Toletus*,—*Pontas*,—*Habert*,—*Gonet*,—*De Charmes*, and the authors of the *Conferences of Angers*, are very good theologians;—Toletus, however, in his *Sum*, and Pontas in his *Cases of Conscience*, treat only of morality.[1]

[1] ☞ A brief and clear statement of the Roman Catholic doctrine may be seen in Fleury's *Historical Catechism*, in two

Here it is proper to observe, that although all Roman Catholic divines unanimously agree in all the articles which are of *Catholic faith*, yet they very often disagree in things which are only matters of *opinion*. In these the Church allows every one of them in speculation, to follow what he, after due consideration, thinks true, or what upon sufficient grounds appears to him most probable; in fine, a just liberty of opinions is allowed every one in these things. Thus the Dominicans and Jesuits warmly dispute, whether effectual grace be really effectual of its own intrinsic nature, as the Dominicans affirm; or whether it be so, because, being offered at a seasonable time, the will of man consents to it, as the Jesuits maintain. In like manner, many divines think the Pope is supernally assisted, when teaching the whole Church about a point of faith or morals, and that in that case he *cannot err*; but other divines deny that this privilege was given him by Jesus Christ.

A thousand instances of this nature, as well in speculative as in moral points of divinity, could be produced, in which Catholic theologians disagree.[1]—This may suffice about the expositions of the Roman Catholic dogmas and morality.

parts. The same doctrine, as now maintained in France, and apparently accommodated to serve Bonaparte's political views, may also be found in the French National Catechism, lately translated by Mr Bogue, 12mo. 1807.

[1] ☞ See an enumeration of various points respecting which they disagree, in the Preface to Brerewood's *Enquiries*, p. 20-1.

The Catholic Church glories likewise in having many eminent masters of a spiritual life. The ascetic works of *Father Lewis* of Granada, a Dominican,—the *Christian Perfection* of *Alphonsus Rodriguez*, a Jesuit,—the *Introduction to a devout Life*, and the *Love of God*, of *St Francis de Sales*, are all excellent in this kind. The two incomparable little books, the *Imitation of Christ*,[1] and the *Spiritual Combat*, have always been in the highest repute and esteem among Roman Catholics; and whoever puts either of them in practice, will soon forsake his irregular attachment to creatures, and be infallibly linked by divine love to his Creator and Redeemer.[2]

[1] ☞ Formerly attributed to *John Gerson*, a French divine, who died in 1429, but now generally ascribed to *Thomas a Kempis*, a German of most exemplary piety, who also flourished in the beginning of the 15th century.—The author of the *Spiritual Combat* was *Laurence Scupoli*, an Italian.

[2] ☞ The most able champion of the Church of Rome, and her system of doctrine, is doubtless *Cardinal Bellarmine*, and perhaps next to him, but far behind him in point of candour and ingenuousness, *M. Bossuet*, Bishop *of Meaux*. And, agreeably to the author's plan of noticing some of the most distinguished authors on both sides, he would observe here, that the reader, who is desirous of knowing the opinion of Protestants in regard to the several heads of doctrine by which the Church of Rome is distinguished from every other religious society, may consult Bishop Stillingfleet's *Council of Trent, examined and disproved by Catholic Tradition*, 4to, 1688. Howel's *View of the Pontificate*, 8vo, 1712. Mr Charles Leslie's *Case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England*, 8vo. 1713. *The Errors of the Church of Rome detected, in ten dialogues, between Benevolus and Sincerus*, &c. by the Reverend

CHURCH GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.—The government of the Roman Catholic Church is Episcopal. This form of church government the Roman Catholics held always to be the one established by Jesus Christ; insomuch so, that the Council of *Trent* pronounces an anathema against any who should deny, either the existence of the hierarchy in the Church of Christ, or its being of divine institution. From this belief, Roman Catholics consider every bishop in his own diocese as the pastor appointed by Almighty God to instruct, direct, and govern, that portion of the faithful, whether clergy or laity, which has been committed to his care. Each bishop, within the precincts of his own diocese, is not only entitled to enforce the general laws of the universal Church, but likewise may, and frequently does, when circumstances require it, frame particular constitutions for the government of his own. These particular constitutions have the full force of law throughout the whole extent of his jurisdiction, until rescinded by an authority equal to that which framed them.

James Smith, 8vo, 1778, second edit. The author of this work left the communion of the Church of Rome, in which he had been educated, in 1764; chiefly, he says, in consequence of his having accidentally met with a copy of Bennett's *Confutation of Popery*, and M. Jean Le Seur's *Eccles. Hist.*—To these may be added *A Preservative against Popery*, containing a selection of many able discourses, by the most eminent divines, of the reign of James II. &c. among which are productions under the distinguished names of Burnet, Cave, Hickes, Patrick, Sherlock, Grove, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Kidder, Wake, Whitby, &c.

This authority to rule and govern the faithful, which Roman Catholics consider inherent in bishops, as being contained in the commission given them by Jesus Christ, must be backed and supported by the means necessary to enforce due obedience to it. And the means which they believe their bishops entitled to use, for this purpose, are, in the first place, serious exhortations and admonitions; and, when these prove ineffectual, the bishop not only may, but sometimes is obliged to make use of the spiritual censures of the Church. To promote the cause of religion, peace, and good order, as well as to correct the wicked, and settle disputes, he calls a diocesan synod of his clergy, and visits his diocese once a year.

A metropolitan bishop, besides the jurisdiction common to him with other bishops in his own diocese, has also a jurisdiction over all the bishops of his province; summons them every third year to a provincial synod for the purposes above hinted at; and the constitutions framed in it, affect all the churches in the province. In like manner, primates and patriarchs have a jurisdiction over all the metropolitans, and other bishops of the kingdoms, or nations, where they hold their dignified rank. The constitutions of the national council, convoked by the primate, bind all the churches in that nation; and the constitutions of the patriarchal council bind all the patriarchate.

Above all these, is the *Pope*, who has power of *feeding*, *ruling*, and *governing* the whole Church,

and exercises his jurisdiction over all, clergy as well as laity. This power, which is purely spiritual, entirely unconnected with any temporal authority, is believed by every Roman Catholic to subsist with equal vigour, now that he is stript of his territories, as when he was absolute sovereign of the ecclesiastical states, which he owed entirely to the munificence of different princes, two[1] of them predecessors of the rapacious usurper who has lately deprived him of them.

His care and solicitude extends to all Roman Catholic churches throughout the world. He makes laws for the universal Church, dispenses with some of them when he sees proper, punishes those who do not obey them, passes sentence upon ecclesiastical causes referred to him, (which ought to be the case with all those of great importance,) and receives appeals from all Roman Catholic bishops in the world.

It is he who convokes a General Council;—invites to it all the Roman Catholic bishops dispersed throughout the globe;—presides in it personally, or by his legates, and confirms its decrees.[2] He constitutes new bishoprics, and makes bishops; deprives bishops of their sees for their crimes, and those unjustly deprived of them he restores.[3]

☞ [1] Pepin and Charlemagne.

☞ [2] The Pope's sentence in certain cases is not definitive, but the party has a right of appeal to a General Council. So *Cajetan*, &c.

☞ [3] An oath of submission to the Pope is enjoined on all bishops by the Romish ritual, and the Pope claims the exclusive

As all Roman Catholic churches had always their senate composed of priests and deacons, [1] whose counsel and assistance the bishop used in the government of his diocese; so the Pope had always his composed of cardinals, who assisted him in the government of the universal church. [2]

right to nominate, or to approve the nomination, and to institute to all Episcopal sees; but this and other claims of the court of Rome are much felt by many Roman Catholic Prelates; and those of France and Spain, in particular, were not careful to suppress their feelings, even in the Council of *Trent*; whence it has been conjectured by some Protestants, that it will be the last General Council, it not being likely that the Pope will put his authority to the hazard and decision of such another assembly.

[1] Vide *Epistolas S. Ignatii Martyr.* ap *Coteler.*

☞ [2] The cardinals are ecclesiastical princes in this church, or the principal ecclesiastics next to the Pope, by whom they are created, and whose council and senate they compose. They are divided into three classes or orders, consisting of six bishops, fifty priests, and fourteen deacons, making in all *seventy* persons, which constitute what they call the *Sacred College.* The six cardinal bishops are those of *Ostia*, *Porto*, *Sabina*, *Præneste* or *Palestrina*, *Tusculum* or *Frascati*, and *Albano.*

The cardinals, who have the title of *Eminence* and *Most Eminent* given them, and wear a *scarlet* hat and cap, fill most of the great offices in the Court of Rome, and have very extensive privileges. They have an absolute power in the Church during the vacancy of the Holy See; they have the sole right to elect the Pope, and are themselves the only persons on whom the choice can fall.

For the mode of electing the Pope, and further particulars respecting both him and his cardinals, see the articles *Cardinal* and *Pope* in Broughton's *Hist. Libr.* or the same articles, together with that of *Popery*, in the 3d edit. of the *Encycl. Brit.*

Thus all Roman Catholics obey their bishops —the bishops the metropolitans—the metropolitans the primates and patriarchs; and all of them their head, the Pope; and of all these is composed *one church*, having *one faith*, under *one head.*[1]

WORSHIP, RITES, CEREMONIES, RELIGIOUS ORDERS, &c.—The worship of the Roman Catholic Church chiefly consists in the solemn oblation, consecration, and participation of the body and blood of Christ, by the ministers of the Church, accompanied with the prayers appointed by her for that purpose; in her liturgy, commonly called the *Mass*, which the whole congregation present offer up to God with the priest. This sacrifice alone excepted, no other external act is used among Christians, which *of its own nature*, expresses the *divine worship* due to the Supreme Being; for all other external acts are promiscuously used to signify natural, civil, religious, and divine worship; and the kind of worship or honour given by them, is determined only by the intention of the person who gives it.

This public service of the church, which the Latins call (*missa*) the mass, is by the Greeks termed (λειτυργια) public ministry or service.—Those prayers and ceremonies which are essential to the sacrifice of the mass, particularly the words of Christ in the institution of the Eucha-

☞ [1] See Dr Barrow's *Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy*, fol. 1687, and Mr Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, &c.

rist, have been invariably the same, in all churches, and in all ages, since the beginning of Christianity. This was not, however, the case with the other less essential parts of the sacrifice, which, as they admitted of, have consequently been subject to, various changes. Hence arise those various liturgies used by different churches in different ages. The most famous of these are, in the East, those of *St Chrysostom* and *St Basil*; and in the West, the *Roman*, the *Ambrosian*, the *Gallican*, and the *Spanish* or *Mozarabic*. That of St Chrysostom has long been in general use in the Greek Church, except that on certain festivals, the liturgy of St Basil, which has longer collects for those days, is made use of.[1] There is besides these, a liturgy still used on certain days, though very rarely, in the Church of Jerusalem, of which it was certainly the ancient liturgy, as it agrees with that explained by St Cyril of Jerusalem, except in a few slight things, which differences seem to have been introduced since that father's time. This liturgy goes under the name of *St James*, and some authors are of opinion, that it was composed by that apostle; but the general opinion is, that it takes his name from its being used in the church, of which he was the first bishop.[2]

☞ [1] See above, vol. i. p. 305.

☞ [2] The liturgy of St James is unquestionably one of the most ancient and valuable that are now extant in the Christian Church. And that it is the same that was used in the Church of Jerusalem, before or about the time of the first Council of Nice, A. D. 325, will appear by comparing it with *St Cyril's*

In the Western Church, where the Latin rite is followed, the Roman liturgy or *missal* is now universally used, with the exception of a few churches in Spain, which still are permitted to use the *Mozarabic*. When the Saracens or Arabians became masters of Spain, the Christians of that country were called Mixt-Arabs, which was easily corrupted into *Mozarabs*; hence their liturgy was called *Mozarabic*, and continued to be used in Spain until the 11th or 12th century, when it gave place to the Roman. Cardinal Ximenes, however, re-established the daily use of the Mozarabic liturgy in a chapel of the cathedral of Toledo: it is also used in the same city by seven old Mozarabic churches, on the days of their patrons only.

This number of different liturgies would naturally lead a person unacquainted with the subject, to expect a great discordance, if not in the substance, at least in the mode, of public worship, which they prescribe. This, however, is so far from being the case, that, upon examination, the authors of these liturgies will be found, one and

5th *Mystagogical Catechism*. It was also formerly, if it be not still, the liturgy of the Monophysite Syrian Christians. See Dr Brett's *Collection of Liturgies*, 8vo, 1720, and "*The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, being the Liturgy of St James, freed from all later Additions and Interpolations of whatever kind, and so restored to its Original Purity, by comparing it with the Account given of that Liturgy, by St Cyril, in his 5th Mystagogical Catechism, and with the Clementine Liturgy*," &c. 4to, *London*, 1744.

all, to have had the same sentiments with regard to the principal parts of the sacrifice; and they only, in some cases, added to, and in others, retrenched a little from, the prayers and ceremonies which they found already established. This *discordant harmony*, as Cardinal Bona calls it, of the different liturgies, seemed to him a convincing proof, that they are of apostolical tradition; and by the apostles, and their successors, diffused throughout the world.[1]

Besides the prayers which the people use to worship God in time of mass, they have many others, some of which they practise daily for the same end; and the clergy, besides their other devotions, are obliged every day to recite the church office, consisting of psalms, prayers, portions of the Old and New Testament, with an abstract of the lives of the saints.

Ecclesiastical discipline having an essential relation to the circumstances of time, place, and persons, is not like faith, which consists of *immutable truths*, and regards the whole church, but

[1] Vid. *Bonam de Reb. Litur.* l. i. c. 9. For the truth of the sacrifice of the mass, see the Protestant authors, Ernestus Grabius *in Iren.* l. 4, *adv. hæres.* c. 32. Thomas Brettius *in peculiar. Diss. quæ exstat in collect. præcipuar. liturg. eccles. Christ.* p. 104. Londini, 1710; and Samuel Jebbeus *in Justini dial.* p. 25. Londini, 1719.

☞ It will, however, doubtless be found, on examining the works here referred to, that their authors acknowledge the Eucharist to be only a *commemorative*, and not a *real*, sacrifice with the Church of Rome.

is *changeable*, and frequently limited as to time, place, and persons. The discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, therefore, having varied at various times, and in various countries, it would be absurd to attempt a full detail of it in a work of this nature.

The fast of Lent, however, is not of this kind. There is no nation as yet, which has embraced Christianity, that has not received it, and, with some variations not essential, held to it.[1] It consists of forty days, in imitation of our Saviour's forty days fast in the wilderness; and it is kept once a year to do penance for sin, and as a preparation for celebrating the great feast of Easter.

The Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, in one week of each of the four seasons of the year, are annually fast days, called *quatuor tempora*, or *Ember days*. The intention of the Church, in the institution of these days, was, that her children, besides doing penance for their sins, might thank God for the benefits they receive from Him, and beg of Him to grant them worthy ministers of the altar; for it is at these times that the clergy are solemnly ordained. It is, moreover, an universal practice, to fast the Vigils before festivals. Besides abstaining at least from flesh meats, it is essential to a fast day, that only one full meal, and that, not before noon, be taken in the four-and-twenty hours of the day. Every Friday in the year is

[1] ☞ Many Protestants have entirely rejected the Lent Fast; and, on the other hand, the members of the *Greek Church* observe *four* great fasts annually. See above, vol. i. p. 360.

kept universally as a day of abstinence from flesh; and, in the Latin Church, Saturday, with a few exceptions, unless Christmas day falls upon them.

Clerical celibacy, as to the higher orders, is a point of discipline as ancient as the church,[1] and had been received and practised always both in the Eastern and Western Churches, until, by a council held in the year 692 at Constantinople, which was never sanctioned by a general coun-

[1] ☞ The members of this Church profess that a vow of perpetual celibacy was required in the ancient Church as a condition of ordination, even from the apostolic age. But Protestants insist that the contrary is evident, from numerous examples of bishops and archbishops, who lived in a state of matrimony, without any prejudice to their ordination or their function. Thus, they observe, that most of the apostles themselves, were married; and that, in the next ages after them, we have accounts of divers married bishops, presbyters, and deacons, without any reproof or mark of dishonour set on them.—E. G.—Valens, presbyter of Philippi, mentioned by Polycarp, and Phileas, bishop of Thonius; of whom the latter, according to Eusebius, had both wife and children. Novatus was a married presbyter of Carthage, as we learn from St Cyprian, who was himself a married man, as Pagi confesses; and so was Cæcilius the presbyter, who converted him, and Numidius, another presbyter of Carthage.

And, that they were allowed to cohabit with their wives after ordination, appears from the charge that St Cyprian brought against Novatus, that he had struck and abused his wife, and thereby caused her to miscarry. The law of celibacy had, indeed, been proposed before, or about the beginning of the 4th century, by some individuals; but even Du Pin makes no question but that the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, decreed in favour of the married clergy; and the same is evident from other councils of the same and following centuries, viz. those of *Gangra*, *Ancyra*, *Neocæsarea*, *Eliberis*, and *Trullo*.

cil, or the chief pastor, some alteration in this discipline took place in the Greek Church. By this council,[1] priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, were allowed, under certain restrictions, to cohabit with the women they had been married to before their ordination; but no priest, deacon, or sub-deacon, once ordained, can marry in the Greek any more than they can in the Latin Church. As to their bishops and monks, celibacy is no less rigorously observed by them, than by the bishops, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, in the Latin Church.

The use of sacred vestments, as well as various ceremonies, have been universally adopted by the Roman Catholic Church for the greater decency in her public worship. Many of these ceremonies are of apostolical tradition; such as the sign of the cross,[2] the renunciation of Satan,[3] with all his works, used in baptism, and many others.

Besides the Lord's day, Roman Catholics universally have been accustomed, since the first ages of Christianity, to keep several holidays annually. Among these, the feasts of our Saviour hold the first rank; and on them the principal mysteries of our redemption are publicly commemorated and explained to the faithful. St Augustin[4] says, that the feasts of *Easter*, *Pentecost*,

[1] ☞ i. e. The Council *in Trullo* called *Quinisext.*

[2] Dionys. *Eccles. hierarch.* c. 4. 5. 6. Tertull. l. *de coron. milit.* Basil. l. *de Sp. S.* c. 37.

[3] Clemens. l. 7. *Constit.* c. 41. 42. Dionys. Areop. *Eccles. hier.* c. *de Bapt.* Vid. Bellar. *contro.* t. 3. de Bapt.

[4] Ep. 54. c. 1.

and the *Ascension*, were kept by the apostles. On the feasts of the Blessed Virgin, of the Apostles, and other saints and martyrs, their heroic virtues and triumphs are pointed out by the Roman Catholic Church to her children for their imitation.

The grandeur of some of the churches and altars, with their ornaments, in Catholic countries, is great; and in the time of divine service, church-music is occasionally used,[1] incense burned, and, since the first ages of the Church, candles lighted in token of joy;[2] and it is the practice of the congregation to kneel almost all the time.

It has been the custom in ancient times,[3] as well as now, to keep the blessed sacrament in churches, lest any of the faithful, struck suddenly by a violent distemper, should be deprived of the happiness of receiving it at their death.—In the beginning, the faithful, who assisted at mass, communicated daily.

[1] ☞ On the Continent, and, I believe, wherever the Church of Rome is established, instrumental music is employed in the public worship of God; but in Scotland, even vocal music is seldom used by Roman Catholics in their chapels, from the fear of giving offence to their Protestant neighbours. But it is hoped there is now little to fear on this score, the known good sense of the latter being out of the question, for a religious toleration of course includes the liberty of publicly *praising* God, as well as praying to Him, in the way most agreeable to conscience; and, it is surely not very consistent with one of the first principles of Protestantism to take offence at our neighbour's praising God in a devout and becoming manner, even were that manner different from that which we ourselves approve and practise.

[2] Hieron. *contra Vigilant.* t. 1. c. 394. Vide *Devot. Institut. canon.* t. 2. p. 310. n. 9.

[3] Cyrill. Alexand. ep. *ad Cælosyr.* t. 6. p. 365. Vide *Devot. Instit. can.* t. 2. p. 95. n. 2.

In process of time, charity waxing cold, this practice was given up, and they were obliged, by a precept of the Church, to communicate thrice a-year; that is, on the feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost; but by the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, the obligation was restricted to once a-year at least, and that about Easter; at the same time all the faithful were commanded to apply in like manner, yearly, with due dispositions, to the sacrament of *Penance*.

There were always in the Roman Catholic Church, since the days of the apostles, Christians, who, living in the world, but despising its goods, and thirsting after those of the next, gave themselves up to fasting, prayer, and heavenly meditation; and these, from their exercises, were called (ασκηται,) *ascetics*. In the third century, and afterwards, some flying from persecution, and many fearing the dangers and corruptions of a wicked world, after the example of St John the Baptist, retired into the wilderness, in order that, by being disengaged from the concerns of this life as much as possible, they might give themselves up wholly to spiritual exercises, and prepare themselves for the next. They were called (ερημιται), *hermits*, from their inhabiting the deserts, and (μοναχοι,) *monks*, from their living in the beginning alone. In the fourth century they began to live together in communities, under certain rules. St Basil, who perfected the monastic institute, drew up rules for his own monks, which almost all the Eastern Church afterwards followed,

while most of the monks in the west used those of St Benet. At first, monks were only laics, but their own necessities, and the good of the Church, calling for it, some of them afterwards were promoted to holy orders; and, except a few in each house, called lay brothers, they are now all clergymen. The ardent love of God and their neighbour, which made them sometimes leave their beloved solitude to succour the Church, and the angelical purity and perfection with which they continually served their Creator, made them be greatly esteemed by the people living in the world.

There are several orders of monks in Catholic countries in every quarter of the globe at this day. We have *Basilians*, *Benedictines*, *Augustinians*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, *Canon Regulars* and others.[1] All these different orders take the solemn vows of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, and all firmly hold the Roman Catholic *faith*, and only differ in their rules of *discipline*, in their dress, in the particular privileges granted by the Pope to each order, in their names, which they generally take from that of their founder, and such like distinctions pertaining merely to discipline. In general, they are exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop, and are immediately under that of the Pope.

[1] ☞ See *a Short History of Monastical Orders, in which the Primitive Institution of Monks, their tempers, habits, rules, and the condition they are in at present, are treated of.* By Gab. D'Emillianne, 12mo, London, 1693.

About the time that monks began to live together, females, retiring from the dangers of the world, dedicated themselves entirely to God, and binding themselves to observe certain rules intended for their advancement towards perfection, began to live in convents. Of these, as of the monks, there are different orders, each following their own rules, and wearing a peculiar habit. The solemn vows of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, are taken by them also, and they are commonly under the government of the bishops, but sometimes are under the jurisdiction of regular clergymen of their own order. After their profession, they are never allowed to go without the enclosure of the convent, during life, without the leave of the bishop, or some cogent reason, such as a nunnery taking fire, &c. and no man is allowed to enter it without a similar permission, which may be granted for a necessary cause. Roman Catholics think, that the origin of *nuns* is to be found even in the primitive Church; for as there were ascetics[1] from the beginning of Christianity, so in the earliest ages of the Church, we find instances of virgins who openly made a vow of chastity, of whom Tertullian, St Cyprian, and Sozomen, make frequent mention.[2] They lived at home, using much the same exercises of devotion that were afterwards exercised by females in convents.

[1] Vid. *Devot. Institut.* can. t. 1. p. 396. n. 1.

[2] Vid. *Devot. Institut.* can. t. 1. p. 419. § xxi. and n. 1. p. 420.

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND.—The Roman Catholic religion has, at one time or other, been spread over the whole known world. We may find in every nation that has embraced Christianity, all those distinguishing characteristics, which are at this day required to constitute a Roman Catholic.[1] We may find them not only professing the same faith as the Popes did, but likewise anxious, upon every occasion, to testify their respect for, and esteem of, him as head of the Church; and desirous to get from, and to give, him proofs of their being in communion with the See of Rome, as the centre of unity.[2] We likewise find, on reading ecclesiastical history, in every age of the Church, an account of deputations from the different churches sent to Rome, when they found it necessary to consult the Holy See upon matters relating to faith or discipline. From

[1] ☞ We may also find in every nation that had embraced Christianity before the æra of the Reformation, all those distinguishing characteristics which are at this day required to constitute a *Protestant*. by consulting "*The Protestant's Evidence taken out of good records, shewing, that for* 1500 *years next after Christ, divers worthy guides of God's Church have, in sundry weighty points of religion, taught as the Church of England now doth*," by Simon Birckbek, B. D. London, 1636, 4to. And to qualify what is said here in regard to the extent of the Roman Catholic religion, see Dr Pagitt's *Christianography, or the Description of the Multitude, and sundry sorts of Christians in the World, not subject to the Pope.* London, 1674, fol.

[2] S. Iren. *contra Hæres.* c. 3. Tertull. l. *Præscrip.* c. 36. S. Cypr. ep. 55. S. Optat. *contra Parmen.* l. 2. S. Hierony. *ad Dam.* ep. 57. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

this, and from what has been said before,[1] may be seen, that there is no nation in Asia, Africa, or Europe, where the Catholic religion has not been preached; and in most it was the only one, for a considerable period, professed, or tolerated. This was the case, with some partial interruptions of heresies arising in some countries, and irruptions of barbarians into others, until the almost total defection of the Eastern Church, by what is called the Greek schism. The Greeks, however, after their first separation, in the year 860, from the Roman Catholic church, were again united to it for a short period, when they once more broke off; and, notwithstanding the efforts of pious and well-designing men to effect a re-union, have still continued obstinate in their schism. The impostures, or, to speak more properly, the successful wars, carried on by Mohammed, and his successors, completed the havoc begun by the Greek schism in the Eastern Church, and have left but a small remnant even of Christianity, in those once flourishing portions of the Catholic church, Asia and Africa. The Roman Catholic religion continued to be professed in Europe until the beginning of the sixteenth century, when Martin Luther, by broaching his novel opinions, began to disturb the peace of the Church.[2] Still, however, the greatest part of Europe continues to profess the Roman Catholic religion. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, it is the established and only

[1] See above, p. 3. &c.

[2] ☞ See Mr Birckbek's *Protestants' Evidence* above, p. 52.

one.[1] In France it was, and now again is, the established, though not the only, religion. In several of the German states, and in Poland, the far greatest number of the inhabitants are Catholics, intermixt in the former country with a few Protestants and Jews; and, in the latter, some Greek schismatics, as well as a few Protestants and Jews, are to be found. Even in those countries where the Protestant religion prevails, there are more or less Catholics to be found. A considerable portion of his majesty's subjects, in the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, are Catholics;[2] very many will be found in Holland; a few in Denmark and Sweden; and a great majority will be found in some, and a part in all, the Protestant states in Germany. In the southern

[1] ☞ In all Roman Catholic countries, the clergy make a great proportion of the inhabitants; so great, indeed, that in Spain the regular clergy alone are reckoned at nearly 100,000.

[2] ☞ From returns of the number of Roman Catholics in England and Wales, made to Parliament in 1767 and 1780, it appeared, that they were 67,916 in 1767, and 69,317 in 1780. They had therefore increased 1401 in thirteen years; and supposing the Roman Catholics in Scotland, at the last period, to have amounted to 15,000, these in Britain would now amount, at the same rate of increase, to about 88,062, *i. e.* to about the ninetieth part of the population, supposing it to be 8,000,000. But I have good authority for stating, that the members of the Church of Rome, within the precincts of the Northern Circuit, if not in the counties of York and Lancashire *alone*, do amount, at this day, nearly, if not fully, to that number.

Of the inhabitants of Ireland, the Roman Catholic may be supposed to be about two and a half to one, or to amount to from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000.

part of America, the whole of the inhabitants, both natives and colonists, are, like those of the mother country, Catholics; which is likewise the case with the Spanish settlements in North America. In the United States there are some Catholics, intermixt with the Protestants, in every province; and one of them, viz. Maryland, was originally Catholic.[1] This is also the case in Canada; for though there are many Protestants settled there, since it became a British province their number bears no proportion to that of the Roman Catholics, who there enjoy the privileges of an establishment. The Roman Catholic religion has likewise been preached in China, by apostolic missionaries commissioned by the See of Rome; and, notwithstanding the violent persecutions that have been raised against it, in that kingdom, where thousands of all ages and conditions have, like the primitive Christians, sealed their faith with their blood, the Catholic religion continues to be professed by a considerable number of its natives.[2]

[1] ☞ "Maryland, like Pennsylvania, follows the religion of the ancient proprietor, *Lord Baltimore*; about one-half of the people are therefore Roman Catholics." JANSON'S *Stranger in America*, chap. xi.—Before the American revolution, Roman Catholics were not tolerated in any of the colonies, excepting in these two proprietory governments of Maryland and Pennsylvania.

For the supposed number of Roman Catholics throughout the world, see below, p. 94.

[2] ☞ We have accounts of a severe imperial edict issued against the missionaries, and their converts, in China, so late as in 1805. And, indeed, such are frequently issued.

AUTHORS FOR AND AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ROME.—As in every age there have been men who, both by word and writ, maintained opinions different from the doctrine of the Catholic church, so there have been always some of her children, eminent for piety and learning, who have employed their talents in expounding and defending those points of her faith, which happened to be controverted in their time. It would be in vain to pretend to give any satisfactory account of the authors, who have written for or against the Catholic tenets, in a work of this nature, as the narrow limits it prescribes would scarce contain a list of the names of all who have written on the subject of controversy; a theme which has employed many able pens, from the earliest ages of the Church to the present day. As all Christians, however, are nearly interested in those unhappy disputes, which have divided Europe since the beginning of the sixteenth century, it becomes in some respect necessary, to mention some, at least, of the most eminent of those writers, who have distinguished themselves since that time on each side. Amongst Catholic controvertists, *Cardinal Bellarmin* holds the first rank; and the Protestants themselves do him the justice to acknowledge, that he, of all the Catholic authors who have written against them, proceeds with the greatest candour in placing their arguments in their true light, and solves them best. *Cardinal Stanislas Hosius*, bishop of Warmia, in Poland, was also one of the ablest polemical writers that *any* age ever produced. W th these may be

ranked *Cardinal de Perron*, in France, a prelate of an extraordinary memory, solid judgment, and rare erudition, who was brought up a Calvinist, but became afterwards a Roman Catholic; and the polemical works of *Bossuet*, bishop of Meaux, are a convincing proof of his great abilities as a controversial writer.[1] Among those who stood up for the Roman Catholic doctrine against *Luther* himself, was *Ekius*, a Swede; and *Driedo*, a doctor of Louvain; *Martin Becan*, a Jesuit; and the two brothers and bishops *Adrian and Peter de Wallemburch*, were able controvertists.

In the British empire, also, there have not been wanting severals who have distinguished themselves in this line. Among the most eminent of these are *Stappleton*, *Parsons*, *Howarden*, *Manning*, and *Mr John Gother*. The last of these was educated in the Protestant religion, but, becoming a Roman Catholic, entered into holy orders, and officiated as a missionary priest in England. The Right Reverend *Dr Richard Challoner*, vicar-apostolic[2] of the London district, has

[1] ☞ Bossuet's *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, was never censured by the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, much less actually suppressed, as stated in some late publications. On the contrary, it seems to have been viewed all along as an orthodox and valuable exposition of the Catholic doctrine; and it is indeed the acknowledged ground-work of the *Theologico-Politico* Catechism, lately published by high authority, *A L'usage de toutes les Eglises de l'Empire Francois.*

What a pity that Lewis XVI. did not think of publishing such a catechism as this last, when he ascended the throne of France!

[2] *i. e.* Roman Catholic bishop. The ordinary succession of Catholic bishops in Great Britain having been cut off by the

also greatly distinguised himself in this line; and Father *O'Leary's* great genius shines in his polemic, as well as in his other writings. The Drs *George Hay* and *John Milner*, at present vicars-apostolic, the former of the Lowland district in Scotland, and the latter of the Midland district in England, have, with great ability, defended the Roman Catholic cause; and to these may be added *Dr Troy*, the present Roman Catholic archbishop of Dublin,—a prelate eminent for his zeal and talents in the support of religion and morality.[1]

Nor are there wanting men, eminent both for their great parts and extensive learning, who have distinguished themselves by their controversial works in defence of the doctrines of the Reformation. *Martin Luther* and *John Calvin* being the first principal propagators of these doctrines, were naturally the first to write in defence of them; but the most judicious of the learned among the Protestants, who have read their works, will, I believe, readily own, that there have been many others, who have done more honour to their cause, by their writings, than these two chief reformers. *Melancthon*, a disciple of Luther, *Beza*, the successor of Calvin, *Peter Mar-*

Reformation, the Roman Catholic bishops, who now act in this country, are merely *vicars* of the pope, with delegated powers only; and, as he holds the apostolic see, they are, for that reason, called *apostolic vicars*.

[1] ☞ See Dr Hales's correspondence with Dr Troy, in the *Anti-Jacobin Review* for 1807.

tyr, *Bucer*, and *Kemnitius*, were unquestionably learned men, who, by word and writ, both propagated and defended the Reformation. *Jurieu*, a Protestant minister in Holland, the antagonist of Bossuet, *Mornay du Plessis*, the celebrated opponent of Cardinal de Perron, and the Achilles of the French Calvinists, *Claude*, *Molinæus*, *Blondel*, and *Dallæus*,—have all warmly impugned the Roman Catholic doctrines; and their controversial works shew them to have been men of great parts, and uncommon erudition.

The Protestant polemical writers which Great Britain has produced, are very numerous; and several of them are eminent for their learning. The *Jewels*, the *Tillotsons*, the *Bulls*, the *Leslies*, the *Stillingfleets*, the *Burnets*, the *Chillingworths*, and the *Middletons*, are celebrated names, and well known in Great Britain by their controversial writings. Among those who have done the greatest honour to the Church of England by their learning, *Dr Pearson*, bishop of Chester, has a just title to be placed. The Right Reverend *Dr Abernethy Drummond*, the present titular bishop of Glasgow, in Scotland, and the Reverend *Dr Sturges*, chaplain to his majesty; the former the polemical opponent of *Dr Hay*, and the latter of *Dr Milner*, have both of them distinguished themselves by their zeal and talents in defence of the Protestant cause.

The controversial spirit seems, however, to have gradually subsided of late years; and, I suppose no sincere Christian will regret it, as the good effects

produced by polemical writings can scarcely be thought to compensate for that want of mutual charity which appears but too frequently to have dictated them. It is therefore to be hoped, that both parties will, for the future, employ their talents for the more useful purpose of endeavouring to stem that torrent of infidelity and impiety which seems to threaten the destruction of Christianity, and all true piety throughout the world.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.—As it is probable that many readers have not had an opportunity of seeing a correct and authentic catalogue of the successors of the Bishops of Rome, from St. Peter to Pius the VII., the *present* Roman pontiff, it is presumed that all such will be well pleased to meet with the same in the subjoined chronological list. A great number of these bishops have been eminent for their learning and sanctity, and many of them have sealed their faith with their blood: These, in the following list, are denoted by the letter M, signifying *martyr*, after their name. The first column of figures after the name, marks the year of that pope's election, and the second, that of his death.

POPES.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
1. St. Peter, *Apos.* M.[1]	- -	65
2. St. Linus, M. -	65 -	76

[1] The learned Protestant, Mr Whiston, in *The Memoirs of his own Life*, p. 599., on the subject of St. Peter's having been

Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
3. St. Cletus, M.	76	89
4. St. Clement I., M.	89	98
5. St. Anacletus, M.	98	100
6. St. Evaristus, M.	100	109
7. St. Alexander I., M.	109	117
8. St. Sixtus I., M.	117	127
9. St. Telesphorus, M.	127	138
10. St. Hyginus, M.	138	142
11. St. Pius I., M.	142	156
12. St. Anicetus, M.	156	168
13. St. Soter, M.	168	177
14. St. Eleutherius, M.	177	192
15. St. Victor I., M.	192	201
16. St. Zephyrinus, M.	201	219
17. St. Calixtus I., M.	219	224
18. St. Urbanus I., M.	224	231
19. St. Pontianus, M.	231	235
20. St. Anterus, M.	235	236
21. St. Fabianus, M.	236	250
22. St. Cornelius, M.	250	252
23. St. Lucius I., M.	252	253
24 St. Stephen I., M.	253	257
25. St. Sixtus II., M.	257	258

at Rome, writes as follows: "*Mr Bower*, with some weak Protestants before him, almost pretends to deny that St. Peter ever was at Rome; concerning which matter take my own former words out of my three tracts, p. 53. *Mr Baratier* proves most thoroughly, as Bishop *Pearson* has done before him, that St. Peter was at Rome." See the posthumous works of Dr Pearson, bishop of Chester, London, 1688, p. 27., &c. Baratier, a Protestant divine, printed at Utrecht, 1740, an *Inquiry about the Ancient Bishops of Rome.*

Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
26. St. Dionysius,	258	271
27. St. Felix I., M.	271	276
28. St. Eutichianus,	276	283
29. St. Caius, M.	283	296
30. St. Marcellinus, M.	296	304
31. St. Marcellus I., M.	304	309
32. St. Eusebius,	309	311
33. St. Melchiades,	311	313
34. St. Sylvester I.	313	335
35. St. Mark,	335	336
36. St. Julius I.	336	352
37. Liberius,	352	366
38. St. Felix II.[1]	-	359
39. St. Damasius I.	366	384
40. St. Siricius,	384	398
41. St. Anastasius I.	398	402
42. St. Innocent I.	402	417
43. St. Zozimus,	417	418
44. St. Boniface I.	418	423
45. St. Celestine I.	423	432
46. St. Sixtus III.	432	440
47. St. Leo the Great,	440	461
48. St. Hilary,	461	467
49. St. Simplicius,	467	483
50. St. Felix III.	483	492
51. St. Gelasius I.	492	496

[1] Liberius being sent into banishment by the Emperor Constantius, for opposing the Arians in his absence, Felix was put in his place. After his death Liberius resumed his former dignity.—See Berti's *Eccles. Hist.* fourth age.

Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
52. St. Anastasius II.	496	498
53. Symmachus,	498	514
54. Hormisdas,	514	523
55. St. John I., M.	523	526
56. Felix IV.	526	530
57. Boniface II.	530	532
Dioscorus, Antipope.		
58. John II.	532	535
59. Agapetus I.	535	536
60. St. Sylverius, M.	536	540
61. Vigilius,	540	555
62. Pelagius,	555	560
63. John III.	560	573
64. Benedict I.	574	578
65. Pelagius II.	578	590
66. St Gregory the Great,	590	604
67. Sabinian,[1]	604	606
68. Boniface III.	607	607
69. Boniface IV.	607	615
70. Deusdedit,	615	618
71. Boniface V.	618	625
72. Honorius I.	625	638
73. Severinus,	638	640
74. John IV.	640	642

[1] ☞ The succession of the Bishops of Rome is generally considered to be very doubtful from *Sabinian* for ages downwards, and, (I wish it could not in justice be added,) the characters of many of them *worse* than doubtful.

The names, even of the *first seven* bishops of Rome, are by no means agreed upon, as may be seen by comparing different catalogues of them.

	Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
75.	Theodorus I.	642	649
76.	St. Martin I.	649	655
77.	Eugenius I.	655	657
78.	Vitalian,	657	672
79.	Adeodatus,	672	676
80.	Domnus I.	676	678
81.	St. Agatho,	678	682
82.	St. Leo II.	682	683
83.	St. Benedict II.	684	685
84.	John V.	685	686
85.	Conon,	686	687
86.	Sergius I.	687	701
87.	John VI.	701	705
88.	John VII.	705	707
89.	Sisinnius,	707	708
90.	Constantine,	708	715
91.	St. Gregory II.	715	731
92.	Gregory III.	731	741
93.	St. Zachary,	741	752
94.	Stephen II.	752	757
95.	Paul I.	757	767
	Constantine, Antipope.		
96.	Stephen III.	767	772
97.	Adrian I.	772	795
98.	Leo III.	795	816
99.	Stephen IV.	816	817
100.	Paschal I.	817	824
101.	Eugenius II.	824	827
102.	Valentine,	827	827
103.	Gregory IV.	827	844
104.	Sergius II.	844	847

Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
105. St. Leo IV.[1] -	847 -	855
106. Benedict III. -	855 -	858
Anastasius, Antipope.		
107. St. Nicolas I. -	858 -	867
108. Adrian II. -	867 -	872
109. John VIII. -	872 -	882
110. Marinus I. -	882 -	884
111. Adrian III. -	884 -	885
112. Stephen V. -	885 -	891
113. Formosus, -	891 -	896
114. Stephen VI. -	896 -	897
115. Romanus, -	897 -	898
116. Theodorus II. -	898 -	898
117. John IX. -	898 -	900
118. Benedict IV. -	900 -	903
119. Leo V. - -	903 -	903
120. Christopher, -	903 -	904
121. Sergius III. -	904 -	911
122. Anastasius III. -	911 -	913
123. Lando, - -	913 -	914
124. John X. - -	914 -	928
125. Leo VI. - -	928 -	929
126. Stephen VII. -	929 -	931

[1] That a pretended woman, called *Joan*, interrupted the series of the succession between Leo IV. and Benedict III., is a most notorious *forgery*; as the learned *Blondel*, though a violent Calvinist, and enemy of the Church of Rome, has, by an express dissertation, demonstrated. On this idle fable see *Lambecius*, *Leo Allatius*, *Mireus*, *Onuphrius*, *Copus*, *Nat. Alexander*; and the Protestants *Courcelly*, *Boxhorn*, *Conringe*, *Vigenery*, *Gassely*, *Cave*, *Schooky*, in BAYLE's *Diction.* at the word *Popes*.

	Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
127.	John XI.	931	936
128.	Leo VII.	936	939
129.	Stephen VIII.	939	942
130.	Marinus II.	942	946
131.	Agapetus II.	946	957
132.	John XII.	957	964
	Leo VIII., Antipope.		
133.	Benedict V.	964	965
134.	John XIII.	965	972
135.	Benedict VI.	972	
	Boniface VII., Antipope.		
136.	Domnus II.	974	975
137.	Benedict VII.	975	984
138.	John XIV.	984	985
139.	John XV.	985	996
140.	Gregory V.	996	999
141.	Sylvester II.	999	1003
	John XVI., Antipope.[1]		
142.	John XVII.	1003	1003
143.	John XVIII.	1003	1009
144.	Sergius IV.	1009	1009
145.	Benedict VIII.	1009	1024
146.	John XIX.	1024	1033
147.	Benedict IX.	1033	1044
148.	Gregory VI.	1044	1046
149.	Clement II.	1046	1047
150.	Damasus II.	1047	1048
151.	St. Leo IX.	1048	1054

[1] This Antipope, it appears, having been some way or other inserted in the catalogue of the Popes, the next John came to be called John XVII.

	Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
152.	Victor II.	1055	1057
153.	Stephen IX.	1057	1058
	Benedict X., Antipope.		
154.	Nicolas II.	1059	1061
155.	Alexander II.	1061	1073
	Honorius II., Antipope.		
156.	St. Gregory VII.	1073	1085
	Clement III., Antipope.		
157.	Victor III.	1086	1087
158.	Urban II.	1087	1099
159.	Paschal II.	1099	1118
160.	Gelasius II.	1118	1119
161.	Calixtus II.	1119	1124
162.	Honorius II.	1124	1130
163.	Innocent II.	1130	1143
164.	Celestine II.	1143	1144
165.	Lucius II.	1144	1145
166.	Eugenius III.	1145	1153
167.	Anastasius IV.	1153	1154
168.	Adrian IV.	1154	1159
169.	Alexander III.	1159	1181
170.	Lucius III.	1181	1185
171.	Urban III.	1185	1187
172.	Gregory VIII.	1187	1187
173.	Clement III.	1188	1191
174.	Celestine III.	1191	1198
175.	Innocent III.	1199	1216
176.	Honorius III.	1216	1227
177.	Gregory IX.	1227	1241
178.	Celestine IV.	1241	1243
179.	Innocent IV.	1243	1254
180.	Alexander IV.	1254	1261

	Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
181.	Urban IV.	1261	1264
182.	Clement IV.	1265	1268
183.	Gregory X.	1271	1276
184.	Innocent V.	1276	1276
185.	Adrian V.	1276	1276
186.	John XXI.	1276	1277
187.	Nicolas III.	1277	1281
188.	Martin IV.[1]	1281	1285
189.	Honorius IV.	1285	1287
190.	Nicolas IV.	1287	1292
191.	St. Celestine V.	1294	1294
192.	Boniface VIII.	1294	1303
193.	Benedict XI.	1303	1304
194.	Clement V.	1305	1314
195.	John XXII.	1316	1334
196.	Benedict XII.	1334	1342
197.	Clement VI.	1342	1352
198.	Innocent VI.	1352	1362
199.	Urban V.	1362	1369
200.	Gregory XI.	1370	1378
201.	Urban VI.	1378	1389
202.	Boniface IX.	1389	1403
203.	Innocent VII.	1404	1406
204.	Gregory XII.	1406, *deposed*	1409
205.	Alexander V.	1409	1410
206.	John XXIII.	1410	1415
207.	Martin V.	1417	1431
208.	Eugenius IV.	1431	1447

[1] This Pope is called Martin IV., because Martin II. is the same with Marinus I., and Martin III. the same with Marinus II.

	Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
209.	Nicolas V.	1447	1455
210.	Calixtus III.	1455	1458
211.	Pius II.	1458	1464
212.	Paul II.	1464	1471
213.	Sixtus IV.	1471	1484
214.	Innocent VIII.	1484	1492
215.	Alexander VI.	1492	1503
216.	Pius III.	1503	1503
217.	Julius II.	1503	1513
218.	Leo X.	1513	1521
219.	Adrian VI.	1522	1523
220.	Clement VII.	1523	1534
221.	Paul III.	1534	1549
222.	Julius III.	1550	1555
223.	Marcellus II.	1555	1555
224.	Paul IV.	1555	1559
225.	Pius IV.	1559	1565
226.	St. Pius V.	1566	1572
227.	Gregory XIII.	1572	1585
228.	Sixtus V.	1585	1590
229.	Urban VII.	1590	1590
230.	Gregory XIV.	1590	1591
231.	Innocent IX.	1591	1591
232.	Clement VIII.	1592	1605
233.	Leo XI.	1605	1605
234.	Paul V.	1605	1621
235.	Gregory XV.	1621	1623
236.	Urban VIII.	1623	1644
237.	Innocent X.	1644	1655
238.	Alexander VII.	1655	1667
239.	Clement IX.	1667	1669
240.	Clement X.	1669	1676

Popes.	*Elected* A. D.	*Died* A. D.
241. Innocent XI.	1676	1689
242. Alexander VIII.	1689	1691
243. Innocent XII.	1691	1700
244. Clement XI.	1700	1721
245. Innocent XIII.	1721	1724
246. Benedict XIII.	1724	1730
247. Clement XII.	1730	1740
248. Benedict XIV.	1740	1758
249. Clement XIII.	1758	1769
250. Clement XIV.[1]	1769	1774
251. Pius VI.	1775	1799
252. Pius VII.	1800	

Whoever wishes to know further particulars respecting the Popes, may consult Berti's *Eccle-*

[1] The reign of this Pope was distinguished by the abolition of the Jesuits. This Society, founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola, and approved by Paul III., in the year 1540, subsisted for upwards of 200 years, and produced, in that period, a greater number of men, eminent both for learning and piety, than have appeared in any other order in the Church during the same time. The members of this society, by their zeal in promoting the interests of religion and piety, and their abilities and success in the education of youth, endeared themselves, in Catholic countries, to all ranks and degrees, both in church and state. They became, however, at last obnoxious to most of the then Catholic sovereigns of Europe; and, at their instigation, after being previously banished from *France*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, and *Naples*, their order was finally abolished by a brief of Clement XIV., dated 21st July, 1773. It has been lately re-established in *Russia* and *Naples*, at the request of the respective sovereigns of these countries; but, in the latter, they have shared the fate *of its* sovereign, expelled his dominions by the common enemy *of all lawful sovereigns*, humanity, and justice.

siastical History, above referred to, from which this list is principally taken.

From what has been remarked above, that it has been the constant practice of the Church, upon particular emergencies, to assemble her chief pastors in *Synods* or *Councils*, it cannot be thought foreign to the present purpose to give here a brief account of the principal of these ecclesiastical assemblies; such, I mean, as Roman Catholics hold to be *General Councils*, and whose decisions, in matters of faith, they of course consider as *infallible*. In order to make this account as concise as possible, I shall barely mention, in speaking of each Council, the place where held; the motive for, and time of, its assembling; the number of bishops convened, and the Pope who, either in person, or by his legates, presided in it. For the satisfaction of those who wish for more information on this subject, references will be found, at the bottom of the page, to those authors who have treated it more fully. [1]

The *first General Council* was held at *Nice*, a city in Bithynia, from whence it takes its name, in the year 325. The errors lately broached by *Arius*, who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, occasioned the assembling of this Council. The blasphemies of Arius, who was himself present, were canvassed for several days. He, and his followers, fearing the indignation of the Council, used a great deal of dissimulation in admitting the Catholic terms. The fathers, to exclude all their subtilties, declared the Son *consubstantial* to the

[1] *L'Abbé, Baronius, Nat. Alexander, Berti, Fleury, &c.*

Father, which they inserted in the profession of their faith, called the *Nicene Creed;* to which all subscribed, except a small number of Arians. The prelates, to the number of 318, who composed this Council, were the most illustrious, at the time, in the Church; among whom were many glorious confessors of the faith. *St. Sylvester,* then Pope, who could not come in person, by reason of his great age, presided in it by his legates, *Osius,* bishop of Cordova, *Vito,* or *Victor,* and *Vincent,* two Roman priests.

The *second General Council* was the first held at *Constantinople,* in the year 381. In it, the *Macedonian* heretics, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, were condemned. The Fathers, in this Council, confirmed the decrees of that of Nice, regarding faith, by adopting its creed, to which they made some additions, explanatory of the Catholic doctrine concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Only the prelates of the Eastern empire, to the number of 150, assisted at this Council; and we find no mention of legates of Pope *Damasus* in it, so that it was general, not in the celebration, but by the acceptation of the universal Church.

The *third General Council* was held at *Ephesus,* in the year 431. There were 200 bishops assembled in this Council, who, after citing *Nestorius,* and his refusing to appear, though in the city, proceeded to the condemnation of his errors, or rather confirmed the sentence already pronounced against him, in a synod held at Rome, the *preceding year,* by Pope *Celestine I.* This sen-

tence was notified to the Council by a letter from St. Celestine to St. *Cyril*, who presided at Ephesus, in the name of the Pope, being joined by him in the commission given to his three legates, *Arcadius*, *Projectus*, bishops, and *Philip*, a priest.

The *fourth General Council* was held at *Chalcedon*, in the year 451. It was composed of 600, or, according to some authors, of 630, bishops. In it, the Catholic faith, concerning the mystery of the *incarnation*, was established against the errors of *Eutyches*, who affirmed that there was but one nature in Christ. *St. Leo*, then Pope, presided in this Council by his legates, *Paschasius*, bishop of Lilybæum, *Lucentius*, bishop of Ascoli, and *Boniface*, priest of Rome.

The *fifth General Council*, being the *second* of *Constantinople*, was held in the year 553. This, like the first of Constantinople, was composed solely of the prelates of the Eastern Church, to the number of 165; and is consequently only a general council, in as far as it was afterwards accepted by the Western Church, and confirmed by Pope *Vigilius*. The principal transaction of this Council, was the condemnation of the *three chapters*; by which are meant the writings of *Theodore* of Mopsuestia, those of *Theodoret* of Cyr against St. Cyril, and the epistle of *Ibis* to *Maris* the Persian.

The *sixth General Council* was likewise held in *Constantinople*, in the year 680, and is called the *third* of that city. According to *Theophanes and Cedrenus*, there were 289, but according to *Photius* only 170, bishops, assembled in this Council; and in the acts there are only 166 subscriptions

to be found. This Council renewed the condemnation of the *Monothelite* heresy, with its authors and abettors, that had been pronounced against them, in a council held at Rome under Pope *Agatho*, the preceding year. The error of the Monothelites consisted, as their name (μονοθελῆται) imports, in allowing only *one will* in Christ. Pope Agatho sent, as his legates to this Council, *Theodore* and *George*, priests, and *John*, a deacon, who presided there in his name.

The *seventh General Council* was called to compose the disputes which divided the Church, at that time, in relation to *holy images*. It was opened on the first of August, in the Church of the Apostles, at *Constantinople*, in 786. But the assembly being disturbed by the violences of the *Iconoclasts*, and desired by the Empress *Irene* to break up and withdraw for the present, the Council met again the year following at *Nice;* whence it is called the *second* of Nice. This Council consisted of 350 bishops, besides many abbots, and other holy priests and confessors, who declared, that the sense of the Church in relation to the matter in debate, was to allow a *relative* honour to be given to holy pictures and images. Pope *Adrian I.* presided in this Council by his legates, *Peter*, archpriest of the Roman Church, and *Peter*, priest and abbot of St. Sabas in Rome.

The *eighth General Council* was held at *Constantinople* in the year 869. The principal business transacted in this Council, was the condemnation and deposition of *Photius*, who, upon the *expulsion of St. Ignatius*, had been intruded in-

to the see of Constantinople, and the restoration of St. Ignatius to his see, which Photius had so unjustly usurped. There were 102 bishops assembled in this Council; and *Donatus* and *Stephen*, bishops, and *Marinus*, a deacon, presided in it in the name of *Adrian II.*, then Pope.

The *ninth General Council*, being the first *Lateran*, was held at Rome, in the *Lateran Basilic*, from whence it takes its name, in the year 1123. It was composed of 300 bishops; who, after mature deliberation, decreed, that investiture to ecclesiastical dignities was the exclusive right of the Church; that the practice, so prevalent at that time, of secular princes giving such investitures, was an innovation and usurpation of a right to which they could show no just claim or title. Pope *Calixtus II.* presided in person in this Council.

The *tenth General Council* was held, like the foregoing, in the *Lateran Basilic*, in the year 1139. It was composed of nearly 1000 bishops; and Pope *Innocent II.* presided in it in person. One great object of this Council was to restore peace to the church, which had been for some years unhappily disturbed by schism. The Fathers, therefore, after a full investigation of the matter, first declared Innocent to have been duly elected, and that he was consequently the lawful Pope; and then pronounced sentence of deposition against Cardinal *Peter*, the son of Leo, who had been elected Pope by a faction, and assumed the name of *Anacletus*. This Council likewise condemned the errors of *Peter de Bruys*, and *Arnold* of Brescia.

The *eleventh General Council* was the *third* held in the *Lateran Basilic*, in the year 1179. The errors and impieties of the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* were here condemned by an assemblage of 302 bishops, with Pope *Alexander III.* at their head. Several canons were also framed in it, to check the growth of simony and usury.

The *twelfth General Council*, or the *fourth* of *Lateran*, was composed of 412 bishops; and Pope *Innocent III.* presided in it. The objects proposed in the celebration of this Council were,—the recovery of the Holy Land; the restoration of discipline; and the condemnation of the errors of the Abbot *Joachim*, of *Amaricus*, and of the *Albigenses*. It was held in the year 1215; and in it the celebrated canon, commanding annual confession and communion, was framed.

The *thirteenth General Council*, or the first of *Lyons*, was held in the year 1245, to adjust the differences between the Pope and the Emperor *Frederick II.*,—to promote the war against the Turks,—and to restore ecclesiastical discipline. It was composed of 140 bishops, with Pope *Innocent IV.* at their head.

The *fourteenth General Council*, or the second of *Lyons*, was held by Pope *Gregory X.*, in the year 1274. It consisted of 500 bishops, and near 1000 of the inferior clergy. The great object of this Council was to extinguish the Greek schism; and this was happily effected. But such was the inconstancy of the Greeks, that their re-union with the Catholic Church was but of short duration. This Council framed also several useful ca-

nons, calculated to promote purity of manners, and the good of religion.

The *fifteenth General Council* was celebrated at *Vienne*, in Gaul, in the year 1311. Pope Clement V. presided in it; and 300 bishops were present. This Council was convoked to suppress the order of the *Knights Templars*,—to condemn the *Fraticelli*, *Beguards*, and other heretics,—to correct abuses in discipline,—and to procure assistance for the Christians in Palestine.

The *sixteenth General Council* was held at *Florence*, by *Eugenius IV.*; and was composed of 141 bishops, the patriarchs of *Constantinople*, and the legates of the patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*. It was opened at *Ferrara* in 1438, and sixteen sessions were held in that city. Next year, the Council being transferred to Florence on account of the plague, the Greeks renounced their schism, and were received into the bosom of the church. After their departure, the Armenians abjured their heresy, and subscribed a decree of union. This Council lasted three years, and was concluded at Rome in 1442.

The *seventeenth General Council* was held at *Trent*. It was convoked and opened under the pontificate of *Paul III.*, in the year 1545; it was continued under *Julius III.*; and after sitting, with some interruption, during eighteen years, it was brought to a close in 1563, under the pontificate of *Pius IV.* In this Council, the pastors of the Church, assembled from the different quarters of the Christian world, concurred unanimously in condemning the novelties broached by *Lu-*

ther and *Calvin;* they explained the Catholic doctrine with the greatest perspicuity, and defined the articles of faith with the utmost precision. Many wholesome regulations were also framed for the reformation of manners, and the restoration of discipline. The Council of Trent was composed of 196 bishops. The History of the Council of Trent, by *Fra-Paolo Sarpi,* is replete with notorious slanders, and wilful misrepresentations. It has been solidly confuted by Cardinal *Pallavicini,* in his elegant history of this Council, composed from the original acts, kept in the Vatican Library, and communicated to him by order of Pope *Alexander VII.*

It is a common mistake amongst Protestants, to suppose that the Catholic laity are debarred the use of the Scriptures, and that the Catholic Church never authorizes any translation of them into the modern languages. It is true, indeed, that the Council of *Trent* has declared the Latin translation, commonly called *the Vulgate,* when cleared from the mistakes of careless transcribers, an *authentic version.*[1] The Council, however, never meant, by this decree, to give it any preference to the original texts, or to exclude other translations, when faithfully executed, either from the originals, or from this authentic version.

The form of *oath, abjuration,* and *declaration,*

[1] On the commendation of the Latin Vulgate, see the ablest Protestant critics, *Lewis de Dieu, Drusius, Milles, Walton, Proleg. in Polyglot.* &c. *Cappell* has adopted many readings of the Vulgate, in places where the modern MSS. of the Hebrew were corrupt.—*Crit. Sacra,* p. 351. 371.

which is taken and subscribed by all English Roman Catholics, as required by the British Parliament of 31st George III., and by all Roman Catholics in Scotland, as prescribed by 33d of his present Majesty, which relieved them from the penalties imposed by the 8th and 9th sessions of 1st Parliament of William III. is as follows:

"I *A. B.* do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman Catholic religion: I *A. B.* do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to his Majesty King George III. and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown; which succession, by an act, entitled, *An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject*, is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Dutchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person, claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms: And I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pre-

tence of their being heretics or infidels; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels: And I further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure, the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or any authority of the see of Rome, or by any other authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever: and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this declaration: And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am, or can be, acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, and declare that it was null or void.—— So help me GOD."

PROTESTANTISM,

AND

PROTESTANTS.

NAME.—The Emperor Charles V. called a diet at Spire, in 1529, to request aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise the most effectual means for allaying the religious disputes, which then raged in consequence of Luther's opposition to the established religion. And in this diet it was decreed by Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria, and other Popish princes, that in the countries, which had embraced the new religion, it should be lawful to continue in it till the meeting of a Council; but that no Roman Catholic should be allowed to turn *Lutheran*, and that the reformers should deliver nothing in their sermons contrary to the received doctrine of the church.

Against this decree six Lutheran princes, viz. John and George, the Electors of Saxony and

Brandenburg, Ernest and Francis, the two Dukes of Lunenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, and the Prince of Anhalt, with the deputies of thirteen imperial towns, viz. Strasburg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Constance, Rottingen, Windseim, Memmingen, Nortlingen, Lindaw, Kempten, Heilbron, Wissemburg, and St. Gall, formally and solemnly *protested*, and declared that they appealed to a General Council; and hence the name of *Protestants*, by which the followers of Luther have ever since been known. Nor was it confined to them, for it soon after included the *Calvinists*, and has now of a long time been applied indiscriminately to all the sects of whatever denomination, and in whatever country they may be found, which have separated from the see of Rome; and these form the third grand division of Christians.

Rise, Progress, &c.—The important period which was justly distinguished by the reformation of our religion, is not to be considered as the period when the principles then embraced first made their appearance. No; long, very long, had purity of doctrine and discipline slept beneath the overloaded ornaments and corruptions of the Church of Rome; but there was a time when that Church herself might have boasted of her primitive purity and freedom from error with other Churches of Christ, as far as that expression is compatible with human infirmity: and there never was a time, from the date of her first departure from sound principles, wherein there

were not witnesses to the truth, or some, more or less, who withstood the corruptions and depravity of their respective ages, maintained orthodox and primitive doctrine, and exhibited in their lives the genuine fruits of our most holy faith. The early spirit of reform may be traced through the dark ages, as manifested first by certain churches of Italy and Gaul, which rejected some of the tenets of Popery; afterwards by the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses;* and by the *Lollards* in England; the *Hussites* in Germany; the *Tramontanes* in Italy; and the *Bohemians*, the *Lombards*, the *Turlupins*, &c.[1]

For the rise and history of the reformed religion from 1517, till the diet of Spire in 1529, see the article *Lutheranism and Lutherans*, below.

At the diet of Augsburg, in the following year, (1530,) a clear statement of the reformed faith, drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, was presented by the Elector of Saxony to Charles V., in behalf of the Protestant members of the empire. It obtained the name of the *Confession of Augsburg*, and was received as the standard of the Protestant faith in Germany. The same, or next year, the Protestant princes made the famous league of *Smalcald*, for the mutual defence of their religion, which obliged the emperor to grant the *Protestant Lutherans* a toleration, till the differences in religion should be settled in a

[1] See Mr Van Mildert's eighth Sermon at *Boyle's Lecture.*

council, which he engaged himself to call in six months. The Protestant party gaining strength every day, instead of being viewed only as a religious sect, as hitherto, soon became to be considered as a political body of no small consequence; and having refused the bull for convening a council at Mantua, Charles summoned a general diet at Ratisbon, where a scheme of religion, for reconciling the two parties, was examined and proposed, but without effect. At length, in 1545, the famous Council of Trent was opened, for accommodating the differences in religion; but the Protestants refused to attend or obey a council convoked in the name, and by the authority, of the Pope, and governed by his legates.

The following year Luther died, but the work of reformation which he had begun did not die with him; for though Charles, having concluded a treaty with the Pope for the destruction of the reformed religion and its adherents, assembled troops on all sides, and was at first successful in the field; on Maurice Elector of Saxony's appearing in arms against him, with a force which he was wholly unprepared to resist, he was checked in his career, and the consequences were, the "*Religious Peace*," concluded at Passau, in Bavaria, in 1552, and the complete security of religious freedom to the Protestant States in Germany, which they have enjoyed ever since.

During the course of these events, the reformed opinions were extending their influence in vari-

ous other countries: before this time, they were completely adopted in Sweden, and had likewise obtained perfect toleration in Denmark, where they were adopted soon after as the doctrines of the national church.

They were also daily gaining converts in other kingdoms of Europe. They acquired many friends even in Italy.

They privately diffused themselves in Spain, notwithstanding the crowded dungeons and busy flames of the inquisition.

In France, they had still more ample success, where their abettors have long been contemptuously termed *Huguenots.*[1]

At Geneva, they were firmly established by Calvin; but their principal triumph was in Great Britain. See the articles *Lutheranism and Lutherans*, and the *United Church of England and Ireland*, below.

The Roman Catholics themselves are ready to admit, that the papal doctrines and authority would have soon fallen into ruin in all parts of the world, in consequence of the opposition made to them by Luther and his adherents, had not the force of the secular arm, and the fire of the inquisition been employed to support the tottering

[1] This appellation was given to the Protestants in France in 1560, and is supposed by some to be derived from a gate in Tours, called *Hugon*, where they first assembled. According to others, the name is taken from the first words of their original protest, or Confession of faith, *Huc nos venimus*, &c.—See other supposed derivations of it in Dr M'Laine's note (*d*) to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* v. 4. p. 384. ed. 1806.

edifice. In the Netherlands, particularly, the most grievous persecutions took place; so that, by the Emperor Charles V., upwards of 100,000 were destroyed,[1] while still greater cruelties were exercised upon the people there by his son Philip II. And the formidable ministers of the inquisition put so many to death, and perpetrated such horrid acts of cruelty and oppression in Italy, &c. that most of the reformed, consulted their safety by a voluntary exile, while others returned to the religion of Rome, at least in external appearance.

In France, too, the *Huguenots* were persecuted with unparalleled fury; and though many princes of the blood, and of the first nobility, had embraced their sentiments, yet in no part of the world did the reformers suffer more.

Charles IX., King of France, having inveigled the Protestant leaders to Paris, by a feigned accommodation, and by the most insidious testimonies of favour, above 500 men of rank, and nearly 10,000 persons of inferior condition, were cruelly massacred there, on the eve of the festival of *St. Bartholomew*, A. D. 1572. Orders were dispatched to all the provinces for a similar execution; and Rouen, Lyons, and many other cities, emulated the horrors of the capital, so that about 70,000 Protestants throughout France were

[1] *i. e.* In the Netherlands, and other parts of his dominions. This fact is asserted by the correct Grotius, although ridiculously, if not maliciously, misunderstood by Mr Gibbon.

butchered, with circumstances of aggravated cruelty.[1] The survivors flew to arms, and five years afterwards, the famous *Catholic League* was formed against the Protestants; who, under Henry, King of Navarre, withstood its fiercest efforts.

This prince was assisted with money by Queen Elizabeth; but on succeeding to the throne of France, in 1589, with the title of Henry IV., he soon sacrificed conscience to policy, and renounced the faith which he had so ably defended.

In 1598, however, he granted to the Protestants, by the *Edict of Nantes*, the secure enjoyment of their religion, and their civil rights: yet during the minority of Louis XIV., this edict was revoked by Cardinal Mazarine, in 1685, since which time the Protestants have often been cruelly persecuted, and those of them who fled into Holland have been since known by the name of *Refugees*; nor was the profession of the reformed religion in France at any time, before the late revolution, so safe as in most other countries of Europe.[2]

Distinguishing Doctrines.—The active spirit of enquiry, natural to men who had just

[1] See an account of this massacre in Sully's *Memoirs*, and also a fine description of it in the second canto of Voltaire's *Henriade*.

[2] See Seckendorf's *Commentar. Histor. Apologet. de Lutheranismo, sive de Reformatione Religionis*, &c. The 4th vol. of Dr Mosheim's *Eccl. Hist.* Bishop Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, and Dr Robertson's *History of Charles the Fifth.*

broken loose from the despotism of Popery, operating differently on different intellects and dispositions, almost necessarily produced a variety of sects; and, in some cases, gave birth to extreme wildness and extravagance of unscriptural doctrine and practice. One great source of contention respected church government and ceremonies. Some Protestant Churches, regarding with abhorrence whatever had been an appendage of the Romish religion, renounced, together with ancient rites, the primeval institution of Episcopacy. Others were of opinion, that it was more wise to preserve whatever was in itself innocent, and to be content with the removal of corruptions. Points of doctrine too caused divisions; and these controversies among the reformers, some of whom long retained a portion of the virulent spirit of popery, were too often conducted, even when they related to matters of secondary importance, with the violence and acrimony by which, in opposing the Roman Catholics, a good cause had been disgraced. They afforded no small matter of triumph to the adherents of the Church of Rome, and impeded, in no small degree, the progress of the reformation.

We are not to expect then, that Protestants are unanimous in all points of doctrine, discipline, worship, or church government; on the contrary, while they agree only in receiving the scriptures as the supreme rule of their faith and practice, and in rejecting the distinguishing doctrines of the Church of Rome, in many other respects

they still differ not more widely from that church than they do from one another: and to ascertain their doctrines, we must examine the public standards, or the *Confessions* and *Articles* of the different churches, sects, and parties, into which the professors of the reformed religion are now subdivided.[1]

All Protestants who are Trinitarians, and I believe, most Protestant Churches, receive the *Apostles'*, *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds*, or the substance of the doctrine contained in them, together with the first *four* General Councils, viz. the first assembled at *Nice*, A. D. 325; the first of *Constantinople* in 381; that of *Ephesus*, which met in 431; and that of *Chalcedon*, held in 451.

Mr Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favour of the Church of Rome, speaks of

[1] These standards are collected in the "*Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum Fidei, quæ in diversis Regnis et Nationibus, Ecclesiarum nomine, fuerunt authentice editæ,*" &c. and some of the most noted of them in the "*Sylloge Confessionum sub Tempus reformandæ Ecclesiæ editarum,*" &c. printed at the University press, Oxford, in 1804.

The former collection contains thirteen confessions, viz. the *Helvetic* or Swiss, the *French*, the *English*, the *Scotch*, the *Belgic* or Netherlands, the *Polish*, the *Strasburgh*, the *Augsburgh*, the *Saxon*, the *Wittenbergh*, the *Palatinate*, and the *Bohemian*, together with the *Consensus* of the churches of Greater and Less *Poland* and *Lithuania*.

The Oxford *Sylloge* contains, besides the *Trent* Confession of Faith, these Protestant confessions,—the *Helvetic*, the *Augsburgh*, the *Saxon*, and the *Belgic*; and also the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and the *Canons* of the synod of *Dort*.

the *Religion of Protestants* in the following terms, worthy, as has been well observed, to be inscribed in letters of gold. "Know then, Sir, that when I say the *Religion of Protestants* is, in prudence, to be preferred before yours; on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of *Bellarmine*, or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongst you, nor the doctrine of the *Sorbonne*, or of the *Jesuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, '*The doctrine of the Council of Trent:*' so accordingly, on the other side, by *the Religion of Protestants*, I do not understand the doctrine of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melancthon*, nor the *Confession of Augsburgh*, or *Geneva*, nor the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, nor the *Articles of the Church of England*, no, nor the *harmony of Protestant Confessions;* but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action, *i. e. the Bible.*

"The *Bible*, I say, the *Bible only*, is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.

"I, for my part, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true way

to eternal happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this *rock* only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age, against a consent of fathers of another age: traditive interpretations of scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: no tradition, but that of scripture, can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of scripture only, for any *considering* man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess: according to this, I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my life, though I should be sorry that *Christians* should take it from me.

Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, *God hath said so, therefore, it is true.* In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me.[1]"

[1] Chillingworth's *Works*, Fol, 1742. It may be proper to observe here, that Mr Chillingworth, who lived about the

But, though their Bible is the only sure foundation upon which all true Protestants build every article of the faith which they profess, and every point of doctrine which they teach; and though all other foundations, whether they be the decisions of councils, the confessions of churches, the prescripts of Popes, or the expositions of private men, are considered by them as sandy and unsafe, or as in no wise to be ultimately relied on. Yet, on the other hand, they do by no means fastidiously reject them as of no use; for while they admit the Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to be the only infallible rule by which we must measure the truth or falsehood of every religious opinion, they are sensible that all men are not equally fitted to apply this rule; and that the wisest men want, on many occasions, all the helps of human learning to enable them to un-

middle of the 17th century, had himself embraced the doctrines of the Church of Rome, through the influence of the noted Fisher, the Jesuit; but on mature deliberation, and more full examination, he returned to the communion of the Church of England, and being severely attacked by the adherents of the Church of Rome whom he had deserted, he vindicated his conduct and the religion which he now embraced, in an able work, entitled, "*The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to Salvation*;" which see bound up with his sermons in folio.

See also Fell's "*Four Letters on genuine Protestantism*," and an excellent defence of Protestantism by Dr. Sturges, in his answer to Mr, now Bishop Milner, who, in his "*History of Winchester*," takes every opportunity of reprobating the Protestant religion, and of erecting on its ruins his beloved edifice of Popery.

derstand its precise nature, and to define its certain extent. These helps are great and numerous, having been supplied in every age of the church, by the united labours of learned men in every country; and I may add, particularly, in Protestant communions.

For the different sentiments of Protestants, in regard to the object of religious worship, see below, p. 100. &c. &c.

WORSHIP, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, AND DISCIPLINE.—For information on these heads, with respect to each of which they differ as widely as on points of doctrine, recourse must be had to the same heads in the account here given of the different and various denominations, great and small, into which the Protestant world is now divided. It may, however, be observed here, that all Protestants profess to abhor idolatry; and that the greater part of them worship the Trinity in unity, and use a Liturgy, or form of prayer, while others use no form, and both the Arians and Socinians confine their worship to God the Father. It may also be observed, that two sects of Protestants (the *Moravians* and *Swedenborgians*) address all their prayers to Jesus Christ.[1]

With regard to Church Government, however widely they may differ in other respects, all Protestants agree in rejecting an universal visible supreme head of the church, together with the in-

[1] See above, Vol. I. p. 201.

fallibility of any church governors or councils whatsoever, from the days of the Apostles; and all their clergy are seculars.

They all, I believe, likewise agree in adopting the principle of the independency of every church in its national character, as subject to no spiritual head but Christ;—as conceding no superiority, and claiming no pre-eminence of jurisdiction;—as authorized to frame its own laws, and to regulate its own government.[1]

NUMBERS, COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, AUTHORS FOR AND AGAINST, &c.—Archbishop Tillotson, in his sermon on Josh. 24. 15. says, that the *Reformed*, thereby meaning Protestants of all denominations, are "not much unequal to the Romanists" in point of numbers; but this is far beyond the common calculation, which allows only from 44, to 50,000,000 to the number of Protestants, while the members of the Church of Rome are reckoned at about twice that number.

The truth, it is likely, may be found between these; and perhaps there might be no great mistake in supposing their numbers to stand nearly in the ratio of three to four; or in reckoning the Protestants to be about 65,000,000, and the Roman Catholics about 80,000,000.

On the Continent of Europe, the Protestants are divided into two grand denominations:—the

[1] See the articles *Episcopacy*, *Presbyterianism*, and *Independency*, below.

Lutherans, who adhere to Luther's tenets, and the *Reformed*, who follow the doctrine and discipline of Geneva. Together with these, this vast class comprehends the *Huguenots* in France; the *Refugees* in Holland; the members of the establishments and the Protestant dissenters of all descriptions in Great Britain and Ireland, together with a numerous body of Christians in North America, the West and East Indies, &c.

Before the late Revolution, the Protestants in France were supposed to amount to 2,000,000 or upwards, though they then had no legal toleration, and almost their only seminary was a private, and merely tolerated, one at Lausanne in Switzerland. But from some recent statements, it appears, that Protestantism is now reviving in various parts of the French dominions. By the union of Geneva, and of the German provinces on the left bank of the Rhine, a very considerable addition is made to the number of Protestant subjects to France. They now enjoy full liberty of conscience and worship, and of propagating their system to the utmost of their power; and they have a provision from the state, at least equal to that of the parochial clergy, &c. *i. e.* an allowance in the country places of about 100l. a year, and in cities and large towns, of about double that sum.

A seminary is also proposed to be established for them, and it is meant that the expenditure attending it, shall be defrayed by means of voluntary contributions and annual charity sermons, throughout the Protestant community in France.

The Protestants in the south of the Low Countries are said to be far more numerous than the Roman Catholics; but in the northern departments, they are only found scattered up and down. Here, we are told, the people have the most contemptible notions of Protestantism, and converts are seldom made from the Church of Rome, but the number of Protestants remain nearly the same, without any apparent accession or diminution.[1]

Indeed, notwithstanding the toleration of Protestantism in the French dominions, and some other favourable signs of the times, considering the late great prevalence of infidelity, and the consequent diminution of true and vital religion on the continent of Europe, it may be questioned whether the Protestant Churches there be in a flourishing state, or in circumstances of discouragement and distress. Some persons of knowledge and discernment are much inclined to the latter opinion, and remark that the witnesses there are still prophesying in sackloth,—that the mystical woman is still in the wilderness, and—that to them it is a matter of doubt, whether pure religion has ever been at a lower ebb, since the days of the Waldenses, than it is at present, with the exception of Great Britain, and perhaps of Sweden. This, however, will be considered by most people, as viewing the subject in too unfavourable a light; but being in some measure a matter of

[1] See Worseley's *Account of France.*

fact and observation, every reader is left to judge for himself.

To the authors already referred to on the subject of this article, Sleidan, Beausobre, Claude, and Milner, may be added; and those who wish to know what has been said on the other side, and in what light the Reformation and Protestantism are viewed by the members of the Church of Rome, may consult Maimbourg, (refuted by Seckendorf) and the works of the Bishop of Meaux, particularly his *Hist. des Variations des Eglises Protestantes.* Paris, 1688; or in English in 2 vol. 8vo.

" It is very remarkable, that a Romanist may turn *Protestant* without adding any one article to his faith, but a Protestant cannot turn to *Rome* unless he embrace many *new* articles; for *our* doctrines are generally confessed by both sides to be true, but those of the Roman church are rejected by our reformers, as novel additions, and such as have no good foundation in Scripture, nor genuine antiquity; and therefore the *Protestant* doctrines are the surer and safer, as in which both sides agree:—For example, we and they both hold there are *two* states after this life, heaven and hell; but they add a *third*, which is purgatory, and this we deny:—We and they both say, that sins are to be remitted by the merits of Christ's death; but they add the merits of the saints, and their own satisfactions, with the merit of their own good works, which we deny to be expiatory, or such as can merit remission for us:—We hold there be two sacraments, Baptism

and the Eucharist; these they confess are the chief, but add *five more*, to which we affirm the name of sacraments doth not properly belong:—We say that God *alone* is to be worshipped; they confess he is chiefly to be worshipped: but then they say, the blessed Virgin Mary, angels, and saints, are to be worshipped *also*; which additions we deny:—We say, Christ is our *only* Mediator and Advocate; they confess he is principally so, but add, that saints and angels are so in an inferior manner; which we utterly deny:—We say Christ is really present in the sacrament of the altar; this they confess, but add, he is *corporally* there by the transubstantiation of the bread, &c. and this we deny:—We say the Scriptures are the rule of faith, and they will not absolutely deny it, but add their own traditions, which we reject:—We say there are twenty-two books of the Old Testament canonical; and they confess these all to be so, but they add divers, and call them canonical, which we affirm to be *apocryphal*. I could give more instances; but these may suffice to shew, that the *Protestant* doctrines look most like the ancientest, as being received by both parties; but the *Roman* opinions are novel enlargements added to the old Catholic truths."[1]

[1] Dr Comber's *Friendly and Seasonable Advice to the Roman Catholics of England*, p. 133, 134, 135, 12mo. 1685.

PREVAILING

DOCTRINES AND OPINIONS,

IN REGARD TO

THE OBJECT OF DIVINE WORSHIP,

THE MEANS AND MEASURE OF THE DIVINE FAVOUR,

AND

THE SUBJECT OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

THOUGH Christianity be now found in its purest state, as to doctrines, worship, and ceremonies, among Protestants, it must notwithstanding be admitted, that some branches of this division of Christians have widely departed from the primitive doctrine, in regard to the object of worship; and also from that primitive form of church-government which universally prevailed in the Christian Church till the æra of the Reformation; or, at least, it is evident that Protestants widely differ on these heads, as well as on the subject of the means and measure of the divine favour. And, as reference will often necessarily be made, in the course of this work, to the prevailing opinions on

all these points, it will be proper that I give the reader some account of them, before I proceed to consider the several Protestant Churches and denominations of the present day.

In regard to the *Object of Divine Worship*, the different opinions which now prevail in the world may be reduced to these four, viz. that—

1. Of the *Trinitarians and Athanasians;*
2. Of the *Sabellians;*
3. Of the *Arians;* and,
4. Of the *Unitarians.*

As to the *Means and Measure of the Divine Favour*, the prevailing doctrines are these three, viz. that—

1. Of the *Calvinists;*
2. Of the *Arminians;* and,
3. Of the *Antinomians.*

And, on the subject of *Church-Government*, three different opinions are now found to be prevalent, viz. that—

1. Of the *Episcopalians;*
2. Of the *Presbyterians;* and,
3. Of the *Independents.*

Of all these in their order.

TRINITARIANISM,

TRINITARIANS, AND ATHANASIANS.

NAMES.—The term *Trinitarian* is applied to all those that profess to believe the doctrine of the Trinity,[1] in opposition to Arians and Socinians, who stile themselves *Unitarians* and *Anti-Trinitarians*.—A great proportion of the Trinitarians receive the creed that goes under the name of Athanasius; and to these only should the term *Athanasian* be applied, and not to all Trinitarians, as is sometimes the case.

The Presbyterians in Scotland, and the three classes of Protestant dissenters in England in general, with many others, both at home and abroad, are Trinitarians, but do not receive the Nicene or the Athanasian creeds, although they hold the substance of the doctrine which they contain;

[1] *Trinity* is not a scriptural term, but was introduced into the church in the 2d century, to express the union of the three persons in the Godhead.

they therefore cannot properly be called *Athanasians.*

By the *Toleration Act,* subscription was indeed required of the dissenting teachers in England, to the *Apostles', Nicene,* and *Athanasian* Creeds, as received by the Church of England; but from this they are now relieved by 19th of George III.

Notwithstanding the strongest evidence that is constantly given them to the contrary, the Jews and others, still insist that Trinitarians destroy the Divine Unity, and worship three Gods, and, of consequence, are *Tritheists*;[1] a name which is not, perhaps, applicable to any class of Christians in our day. Even Crellius, who has been reckoned the most acute of the Socinians, is candid enough to acknowledge, that they who hold the Trinity, are not justly chargeable with believing

[1] Some are of opinion, that it may be applied to those who make the Son *essentially* inferior to the Father, and yet call him God.—That the Son is subordinate to the Father, is what, says Dr Eveleigh, "no sound member of the Catholic Church has ever denied." Yet Christian divines seem to have widely differed as to the nature and extent of this subordination; but most Trinitarians, I believe, maintain, that, with respect to our Lord's *divinity*, he is in no sense subordinate to the Father. "The subordination of the Son, admitted by Pearson, Bull, Waterland, Bishop Horsley, and others, implies no inferiority in the divine nature of Christ, but a difference of *order* and *office.*"—Mr GRAY'S *Bamp. Lect.* p. 134. Note, where the author refers his readers to "*Defens. Fid. Nicæn.* cap. 11.; Pearson on the *Creed;* Waterland on the *Athanasian Creed,* and Preface to eight Sermons on the *Defence of the Divinity of Christ;* Bishop Horsley's 15th *Letter* to Priestley; Tertull. *Advers. Prax.* c. 9. 12. 13."

more Gods than one, because of the *strict unity* which they maintain to subsist in the Divine Essence.[1]

RISE, HISTORY, &c.—The enemies of the doctrine of the Trinity insist, that it was an invention of the first ages of the Church; or, that it was borrowed from the Platonic school. But, in the opinion of its friends, the understanding of man can never be more grossly insulted, than when such people labour to persuade them, that a truth, so awfully sublime as that of the Trinity, could ever be the offspring of human invention; nor, according to them, can history be more violated, than when it is made to assign the origin of this doctrine to Plato,[2] or to any of the schools of Greece.

"Equally above the boldest flight of human genius to invent, as beyond the most extended limit of human intellect fully to comprehend, is the profound mystery of the ever blessed Trinity. Through successive ages, it has remained impreg-

[1] See the passage cited in Stillingfleet, on the sufferings of Christ, part 2d, near the end, vol. iii. p. 407. of the Bishop's works in folio. It is obvious to remark here, that the modern Socinians, now called *Unitarians*, do not think so favourably of Trinitarians and their doctrine; on the contrary, it is by no means unusual with them to rank together *Trinitarianism* and *transubstantiation*, as being no doubt, in their opinion, both entitled to the same degree of *in*credibility.

[2] Dr Cudworth proves, that there were others among the ancient Pagans, besides the Platonists, who had some notion of a Trinity.—See his *Intellectual System*, b. i. c. 4.

nable to all the shafts of impious ridicule, and unshaken by the bolder artillery of blasphemous invective. It is ever in vain that man essays to pierce the unfathomable *arcana* of the skies. By his limited faculties, and superficial ken, the deep things of eternity are not to be scanned. Even among Christians, the Sacred Trinity is more properly a subject of belief than of investigation; and every attempt to penetrate into it, farther than God, in his holy word, has expressly revealed, is at best an injudicious, and often a dangerous, effort of mistaken piety. If we extend our eye through the remote region of antiquity, we shall find this very doctrine, which the primitive Christians are said to have borrowed from the Platonic school, universally and immemorially flourishing in all those Eastern countries where history and tradition have united to fix those virtuous ancestors of the human race, who, for their distinguished attainments in piety, were admitted to a familiar intercourse with Jehovah, and the angels, the divine heralds of his commands,"[1] &c.

[1] Mr Maurice's *Dissertation on the Oriental Trinities*, p. 39, 40.

Following the leading ideas of Sir William Jones, Mr Maurice asserts, that there is a perpetual recurrence of Sacred Triad of Deity in the Asiatic mythology; and that the doctrine of a Trinity was promulgated in India, in the *Geeta*, 1500 years before the birth of Plato: for of that remote date are the Elephantia cavern, and the Indian history of *Mahabbaret*, in which a Triad of Deity is alluded to and designated. Hence he sup-

Such is the opinion of one zealous friend of the doctrine of the Trinity; and although some of his brethren may not be disposed to adopt his views on the subject, in their full extent, yet to all Trinitarians, I believe it is evident that the devotions of the ancient Church, in the apostolical, and every succeeding age, were paid to every person of the Trinity. Thus, Polycarp's doxology is to the whole Trinity; and Justin Martyr declares, that the object of their worship was the whole Trinity.[1] To which they add the testimony of Origen,[2] who, comparing the practice of heathens and Christians, says, that the former, having forsaken the Creator, worshipped the creature; but the latter worshipped and adored no creature, but only *the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.*[3]

Most writers, before Vossius, took it for granted, that what is called the *Athanasian* Creed, was drawn up by Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in the 4th century; but it is now generally thought not to be his, and to have been written

poses, that the doctrine of a Trinity was delivered from the ancient patriarchs, and diffused over the East, by the migration and dispersion of their Hebrew posterity.

[1] Lactant. l. iv. c. 16.

[2] In Rom. 1. See Broughton's *Histor. Libr.* v. ii. 472.

[3] Even Dr Priestley himself very candidly admits, that all the early writers that have come down to us, except the author of the *Clementine Homilies and Recognitions*, were Trinitarians, from Justin Martyr to Athanasius, *i. e.* from the middle of the 2d century to the middle of the 4th.—See the *Append.* to his *History of Early Opinions*, vol. iv. p. 391.

originally in Latin, for the use of some part of the Western Church. It is commonly attributed to *Vigilius*, the African, who lived about the end of the 5th century; but Dr Waterland concludes, from five reasons which he assigns, that "Hilary, bishop of Arles, about the year 430, composed the *Exposition of Faith*, which now bears the name of the *Athanasian Creed*, for the use of the Gallican clergy, and particularly those of the diocese of Arles."[1]—This creed obtained in France about A. D. 850, and was received in Spain and Germany about 100 or 180 years later. It was in common use in some parts of Italy in 960, and was received at Rome about 1014. And we have clear proofs of its having been sung alternately in the churches in Britain in the 10th century. We do not learn, however, that it ever had the sanction of any council; nor is it yet fully ascertained, how far it is acknowledged by the Greek and Eastern Churches.[2]

As to the matter of this creed, according to all those that embrace its doctrines, it is a summary of the true orthodox faith, and a condemnation of all heresies, respecting the object of our faith, both ancient and modern. But, unhappily, it has proved a fruitful source of controversy; for, because there are some clauses in it, which threaten damnation to all those who do not give their as-

[1] See his *Crit. Hist. of the Athanasian Creed.*

[2] That it is received by the Greek Church, may doubtless be concluded from its having the sanction of public authority in the Russian Church. See Vol. I. of this work, p. 352.

sent to the doctrines laid down in it, some, even of those who do assent to them, have taken occasion from thence to object against the use of it altogether.

It is not, however, so much from a dislike to these clauses, that a great proportion of Trinitarians, viz. the Presbyterians, &c. have not formally adopted this and the *Nicene* Creed; as from the difficulty, in their minds, of reconciling some passages in them to the scriptural doctrine of Three Persons in one Essence: particularly, "*Light of Light, God of God;*" as, say they, "there can be no communication of the divine essence,—no derivation of essence, but of personality only."—By following up these expressions far beyond their original design, they further observe, some have fallen into Arianism, even when writing against it.

For the history of the doctrine of the Trinity itself, the various doctrines propagated relative to it in the early ages after Christ, and the contests which have not ceased to agitate the Church, from the 3d century to the present day, the reader may consult Bishop Bull, particularly his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, Dr Mosheim, and its most successful modern defender, Bishop Horsley.

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINE.—The doctrine of the Trinity, as professed in the Christian Church, is briefly this:—That there is *one God*, in three distinct *Persons*, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: the term *Person* here characterizing the mode of subsistence in the Essence, which the Greek Fa-

thers called *Hypostasis.*[1] The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are believed to be three distinct persons in the divine nature, because the Holy Scriptures, in speaking of these three, do distinguish them from one another, as we use, in common speech, to distinguish three several persons; and each of these three persons are affirmed to be God, because the names, properties, and operations of God, are, in Scripture, attributed to *each* of them.

The Athanasian Creed makes the Supreme Being to consist of three persons, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. The *first* of those three persons it makes to be the *Father;* the *second person* is called the *Son,* and is said to be descended from the Father, by an eternal generation of an ineffable and incomprehensible nature in the essence of the Godhead; the *third* person is the *Holy Ghost,* derived from the Father and the Son, but not by generation, as the Son is derived from the Father, but by an eternal and incomprehensible procession.

Each of these persons is very and eternal God, as much as the Father himself; and yet, though distinguished in this manner, they do not make

[1] "By *Person* is not meant," says Bishop Burnet, when speaking on this subject, "such a being as we commonly understand by that word, *a complete intelligent being, distinct from every other being;* but only that every one of that Blessed *Three* has a peculiar distinction in himself, by which he is truly different from the other two."—*Four Discourses,* 8vo, 1694, *p. 96.*

three Gods, but one God.[1] "The Catholic faith is this,—that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal."[2]

This system also includes in it the belief of two natures in Jesus Christ, viz. the divine and human, subsisting in one person.

The doctrine of the Trinity is called a *mystery*, because we are not able to comprehend the particular *manner* of the existence of the three persons in the divine nature. But though a doctrine be *above* reason, Trinitarians observe, it is not, therefore, *contrary* to reason; and the divine nature being infinite, must consequently be above our comprehension. As to the seeming contradiction of an *Unity* in *Trinity*, and *Trinity* in *Unity*, i. e. of *One* being *Three*, and *Three One*, they answer, that it is not affirmed, they are *one* and *three* in the same respect;—that the divine *Essence* can be but one, and, therefore, there can be no more Gods than *one*; but because the Scriptures, which assure us of the Unity of the divine essence, do likewise with the Father join

[1] "Tres non Statu sed Gradu; nec Substantia, sed Forma; nec Potestate, sed Specie: Unius autem Substantiæ, et Unius Status, et unius Potestatis, quia *Unus Deus*," &c.—TERTUL. *Advers. Prax.* cap. ii.

[2] *Athanasian Creed*, which see in the *Common Prayer-Book* of the Church of England.

the Son and Holy Ghost, in the same attributes, operations, and worship, therefore they are capable of number, as to their *relation to each other*, though not as to their *essence*, which is but *one*.

But notwithstanding all that is revealed on the subject of the ever Blessed Trinity, (and it must be admitted on all hands, that enough is revealed for our *necessary* information, in our present state of existence,) all Trinitarians are ready to allow, that there is still much above our comprehension; and they insist, that whatever may be inexplicable should be charged to the weakness of our understandings, and not to the absurdity of the doctrine itself.[1]

"He," says Bishop Taylor, "who goes about to speak of the mystery of the Trinity, and does it by words and names of man's invention, talking of essences, and existences, hypostases, and personalities, priorities in co-equalities, and unity in pluralities, may amuse himself, and build a tabernacle in his head, and talk something he knows not what; but the *good* man, that feels the power of the Father, and to whom the Son is become wisdom, sanctification, and redemption, in whose heart the love of the Spirit of God is shed

[1] "God is pleased to reveal the *fact*; man insists upon apprehending the *mode*: in his present state he *cannot* apprehend it; he therefore denies the fact, and commences unbeliever."—Bishop HORNE.

See Bishop Gastrell's *Considerations on the Trinity*, 4to, 1696; or in Dr (now Bishop) Randolph's *Enchiridion Theologicum*.

abroad, this man, though he understands nothing of what is unintelligible, yet he alone truly understands the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.[1]

Much information on this subject in general, may be found in the second volume of Dr Doddridge's *Lectures*; and in Part VII. Prop. 138., a brief account of some of the most celebrated of the opinions among the *moderns*, concerning it, especially of the English writers.

WORSHIP, NUMBERS, AUTHORS PRO AND CON., &c.—While *Unitarians* address God in the person of the Father only; Trinitarians and Athanasians pray to one God in three persons; and they, in general, look for acceptance, and an answer to their prayers, only through the merits and mediation of Christ.[2]

Almost all professing Christians, the *Sabellians*, *Arians*, and *Socinians*, excepted, believe in the Trinity; but the Greek Church, as already observed,[3] differs from other Trinitarians, in maintaining, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *only*, and not from the Father and the Son.

[1] Bishop Taylor on St. John, vii. 17.

[2] I have said, *in general*, for it is quite consistent, both with the principles and the practice of the members of the Church of Rome, to pray to angels and saints, and to ascribe victory, &c. to particular saints, and especially to the miraculous interposition of the Virgin Mary, "*the Lady of Battles!*"—See the public newspapers of last July (1808).

[3] See Vol. I. p. 301.

Besides the works already referred to, the following, among many others, may be consulted in defence of the Trinity, and of the Athanasian Creed: Dr Allix's *Judgment of the Jewish Church;* Bishop Pearson *On the Creed;* Dr Hammond on the Creeds, in the first volume of his Works; *Vindication of the Trinity from the Works of Tillotson and Stillingfleet;* Dr Waterland's *Importance of the Holy Trinity;* Dr Ridley's and Mr Wheatley's *Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture;* Mr Jones' *Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity;* Lloyd's *Vindication of the Athanasian Creed;* Rotheram's *Apology for the Athanasian Creed;* and Archdeacon Dodwell's three *Charges* on the Athanasian Creed, published by his son.

See also Dean Tucker's *Dispassionate View of the Difficulties of Trinitarian, Arian, and Socinian Systems;* and Pike's *Impartial View of the Principal Difficulties that affect the Trinitarian, or clog the Arian Scheme.*[1]

Those who wish to know what has been said by the *Anti-Trinitarians,* in favour of their respective schemes, may consult the *Poloni Fratres;* the writings of Dr Priestley; *An Essay on Spirit; The Confessional;* Dr Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity; Ben Mordecai's Apology,* 2d edit. &c.[2]

[1] A most elaborate defence of the Trinity was published about the beginning of the 17th century, by *Ritangelius,* a converted Jew. But, perhaps, none of the moderns have defended the Catholic system more ably than Bishop *Bull.*

[2] The full title of this last work is, *The Apology of Benjamin Ben Mordecai to his Friends, for embracing Christianity, in*

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.—The Christian Trinity is not a Trinity of principles, like that of the Persian philosophers; it does not consist of mere logical notions, and inadequate conceptions of the Deity, like that of Plato; but it is a Trinity of *subsistences*, or *persons*, joined by an indissoluble union; and if it be true, "it is no doubt *in the highest degree important and interesting*."[1]

"Say not," observes the late pious and excellent Bishop Horne, "say not, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a matter of curiosity and amusement only. Our religion is founded upon it: For what is Christianity, but a manifestation of the three divine persons, as engaged in the great work of man's redemption, begun, continued, and to be ended by them, in their several relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, three persons, one God?—If there be no *Son* of God, where is our redemption? If there be no *Holy Spirit*, where is our sanctification?—Without both, where is our *salvation?*

Seven Letters to Elisha Levi, Merchant of Amsterdam; together with an Eighth Letter on the Generation of Jesus Christ, with Notes and Illustrations. The 2d edit. with Alterations and Additions. By Henry Taylor, rector of Crawley, and vicar of Portsmouth; London, 1784, 2 vols. "These letters were printed at various times, from 1771 to 1777, in 4to; they are composed with great learning and ingenuity, and contain the most formidable attack on, what is called, the Athanasian system, that is any where to be met with."—Bishop WATSON's Catal. in the last vol. of his *Tracts*.

[1] So can even Dr Priestley say; see Dr Horsley's *Letters* to him, p. 186.

"And if these two persons be any thing less than divine, why are we baptized, equally, in the name of *the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?*—Let no man therefore deceive you: 'This is the true God, and eternal life."[s]

[s] 1 John, v. 20.

Sermon on *The Trinity in Unity*, (in the fifth volume of his Lordship's Sermons,) which see, together with that on *The Duty of contending for the Faith*, in the same volume.

SABELLIANISM,

AND

SABELLIANS.

NAMES.—The *Sabellians* were so called from Sabellius, a presbyter, or, according to others, a bishop, of Upper Egypt, who was the founder of the sect. As, from their doctrine, it follows that God the Father suffered, they were hence called, by their adversaries, *Patripassians;* and, as their idea of the Trinity was by some called a *Modal Trinity*, they have likewise been called *Modalists.*

Sabellius having been a disciple of Noëtus, *Noetians* is another name by which his followers have sometimes been known;—and as, from their fears of infringing upon the fundamental doctrine of all true religion, the *unity* of God, they neglected all distinctions of persons, and taught the notion of *one God* with *three names*, they may hence be also considered as a species of *Unitarians.*

Rise, &c.—Sabellius flourished about the middle of the 3d century, when his doctrine began to be known under the persecution of *Valerian*. It had its rise, and chiefly prevailed in *Ptolemais*, or *Barce*, one of the five cities of *Pentapolis*, a province of *Upper Egypt*;[1] and it seems to have had many followers, for some little time; but its growth was soon checked by the opposition made to it by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, and the sentence of condemnation that was pronounced upon its author by Pope Dionysius, in a council held at Rome, A. D. 263.

It was afterwards condemned in a council at Alexandria, A. D. 319. Epiphanius however remarks, that its abettors had spread in considerable numbers throughout Mesopotamia, and in the neighbourhood of Rome; and the circumstance of their baptism having been rejected in a council at Constantinople, A. D. 381, is a proof that the sect was not then extinct. But St. Augustine seems to be of opinion, that it had no existence in the beginning of the 5th century.[2]

And though the adherents of Sabellianism, properly so called, have at no time been numerous in the Church since that period, yet their doctrine has given occasion to, or, at least, modifications of it have subsisted in, various succeeding heresies; and it is said to subsist, at this day, in

[1] Euseb. *Hist.* lib. vii. cap. 6., &c. Hence it was called *Damnabilis Pentapolitana Doctrina.*

[2] Aug. *De Hær.* c. 4.

the creed of many of the *General* Baptists in the principality of Wales. The *Swedenborgians*, also, have lately been charged with Sabellianism; and I am not yet aware that they have effectually repelled the charge.

DISTINGUISHING TENET.—Sabellius taught, that there is but one *person* in the Godhead; and, in confirmation of this doctrine, he made use of this comparison:—as man, though composed of body and soul, is but one person, so God, though he is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is but one person. Hence the Sabellians reduced the three persons in the Trinity to three *characters* or *relations*, and maintained, that the *Word* and *Holy Spirit* are only *virtues*, *emanations*, or *functions*, of the Deity;—that he who is in heaven is the *Father* of all things;—that he descended into the Virgin, became a child, and was born of her as a *Son*;—and that, having accomplished the mystery of our redemption, he diffused himself upon the apostles in tongues of fire, and was then denominated the *Holy Ghost*. This they explained by resembling God to the sun, the illuminative virtue or quality of which was the *Word*, and its warming virtue the *Holy Spirit*. The word, according to their doctrine, was darted, like a divine ray, to accomplish the work of redemption; and, having reascended to heaven, the influences of the Father were communicated, after a like manner, to the apostles.

They also attempted to illustrate this mystery by one light kindled by another;—by the fountain and stream, and by the stock and branch.

Such are the sentiments that have been maintained by the Sabellians;—with regard to those of Sabellius himself, the accounts are various. According to some, he taught, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were one subsistence, and one person, with *three names;* and that, in the Old Testament, the Deity delivered the law as *Father;* in the New Testament dwelt among men as the *Son,* and descended on the apostles as the *Holy Spirit:* and this is said to be the opinion which gains ground among the Baptists in Wales. According to Mosheim, his sentiments differed from those of Noëtus, in this, that the latter was of opinion, that the *person* of the Father had assumed the human nature of *Christ;* whereas Sabellius maintained, "that a certain *energy* only proceeded from the Supreme Parent, or a certain *portion* of the divine nature, was united to the Son of God, the man *Jesus;* and he considered, in the same manner, the *Holy Ghost* as a *portion* of the everlasting Father."[1]

Others, again, represent his sentiments in a different light; yet all seem to agree, that both he and his followers confounded the three persons of the ever blessed Trinity. And here it

[1] Mosheim's *Eccl. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 305. Hence, as Dr Mosheim observes, the Sabellians could not justly be called *Patripassians,* in the same sense that the *Noetians* were so called.

may be remarked, in general, that the accounts which are given us of heretics and sectarists, both ancient and modern, should be received with great caution, unless strongly authenticated; and particularly when the representations are transmitted to us by their adversaries, which, in regard to the ancient heretics, is generally the case. Yet, when history furnishes no better materials, it cannot be unfair to exhibit all that we know of them, constantly keeping this caution in our view.

AUTHORS FOR AND AGAINST SABELLIANISM. —Almost all the historians, who give accounts of the ancient heresies, have made particular mention of Sabellius;—*Dionysius*, *Athanasius*, and *Epiphanius*, wrote against him and his doctrine;[1] and all the passages of the ancient authors, relating to him, are collected by the learned *Christopher Wormius*, in his *Hist. Sabelliana*, 8vo. Francfort and Leipsick, 1696.

In modern times, and on the other hand, Dr Watts is supposed to have become a Sabellian,

[1] Vide Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vii. cap. 5.; Athanas. *Lib. De Sententia Dionysii*; ejusdem *Orat. contra Sabellii Gregales*; Epiphan. *Hæres.* 62.

Lucian the Martyr is said to have drawn up a creed in opposition to the Sabellians; and Ruffinus observes, that the words *invisible* and *impassible* were added to the creed of *Aquileia*, in opposition to the Sabellians, who asserted, that the Father was visible and passible in human flesh.—RUFFIN. *Expos. in Symbol.* sect. 7.

towards the close of his life, and to have then written several pieces in defence of it.

His sentiments, in regard to the Trinity, appear to Mr Evans to have been, that "the Godhead, the Deity itself, personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus; in consequence of which union, or *indwelling* of the Godhead, he became properly God."—This *indwelling* scheme, which has, no doubt, some appearance of Sabellianism, is chiefly founded on Colossians, ii. 9., where St. Paul, speaking of Christ, says,—"In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

"Mr Palmer, in his useful edition of *Johnson's Life of Watts*, observes, that Dr W. conceived this union to have subsisted before the Saviour's appearance in the flesh; and that the human soul of Christ existed with the Father from before the foundation of the world: on which ground he maintains the real descent of Christ from heaven to earth, and the whole scene of his humiliation, which he thought incompatible with the common opinion concerning him. Dr Doddridge is supposed to have been of these sentiments, and also Mr Benjamin Fawcet, of Kidderminster, who published a valuable piece, entitled, *Candid Reflections concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity*."[1]

[1] Mr Evans's *Sketch*, who refers his readers to Dr Watts' *Last Thoughts on the Trinity*, in a pamphlet, printed by the Dr in 1745, *i. e.* only three years before his death, and republished by the Reverend Gabriel Watts, now of Chichester.

In proving the Divinity and *Personality* of the Son and Holy Ghost, against the Sabellians, &c. Trinitarians argue thus:—there is nothing more certain, than that the Christians have always adored Jesus Christ as their God. This is evident from the *Apologies*, the *Acts* of the Martyrs, and the testimonies of the *heathens themselves*, as Pliny's *Letter to Trajan*, and the objections of Celsus, and Julian the Apostate.

It is moreover certain, that the Christians never worshipped but one God only; so that Jesus Christ is the same God with the Father who created the universe. But it is further certain, that Jesus Christ is the *Son* of God; and the same cannot be Father and Son, with respect to himself, as Tertullian very well demonstrates against *Praxeas;* for in this case, what Jesus Christ says of himself, as that he proceeds from the Father,—that the Father has sent him,—and that he and the Father are one, would be wild and absurd. It were in effect to say, I proceed *from myself*,—have *sent myself*,—and *I and I are one*. Nor can sound reason admit any other interpretation of these, and such like expressions, than that which owns Jesus Christ as a person *distinct from* the Father, though he be the same God.

Again, it is no less certain, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, and is sent by the Father as well as the Son, but *distinct from* the Son, since it is no where said that he *is the Son*, or *begotten*. He is equally named with them

in the form of baptism,—" Go, &c. and *baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*:"—he is therefore a *third person*, but the same God.

ARIANISM, AND ARIANS.

NAMES.—The Arians derive their name from *Arius*, a native of Lybia, in Africa, and a presbyter of Alexandria about the year 315; who owned Christ to be God, yet maintained him to be inferior to the Father, even as to his Deity, and his essence to be different from that of the Father; and that he was neither co-eternal nor co-equal with him; also that the Holy Ghost was not God. But the modern Arians differ very widely from their predecessors; and the term *Arian* is now said to be applied to all those who consider Jesus Christ as simply inferior and subordinate to the Father.[1] That Christ was the Creator of the world, is now believed only by a part of the Arians; but they *all* maintain, in opposition to the Socinians, that he existed previous to his incarnation, though in his pre-existent state they assign him different degrees of dignity; and hence the appellation of

[1] Such an indiscriminate application of the term is, however, by no means correct. See above, p. 102. Note.

Semi, *High*, and *Low* Arian.—Arians of all descriptions claim the appellation of *Unitarians*. But, says Mr Belsham, "Genuine Arianism is not, and cannot be, Unitarianism; for it believes in two Gods, a great God, and a lesser one, and in two Creators, one supreme, and the other subordinate."[1]

Rise, Progress, and History.—From the earliest ages of Christianity to the present day, various have been the doctrines and opinions respecting the Trinity which have prevailed in the Christian Church; and most of them have regarded the person, natures, offices, or merits of the Redeemer. Doubts respecting his real divinity seem to have arisen even in the apostles' days; yet to them we are indebted for St. John's Gospel; for it is generally allowed, that he wrote against Ebion and Cerinthus, who took upon them to deny that fundamental and important truth.

"At first it (Arianism) arose a 'little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand.' But, in a short

[1] *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. p. 142. Mr Belsham seems disposed to confine the term *Unitarians* to the modern Socinians, and the *Low* Arians, or believers in the simple pre-existence of Christ, whom he does not admit to be *genuine* Arians.

Emlyn and *Whiston* appear to be the first of the Arians who claimed the title of Unitarians; yet the latter seemed to prefer that of *Eusebian*. *Dr Price* also eagerly challenged the appellation of Unitarian, which he defined to be one "who believes that there is but one God, and one object of religious worship."

time, 'the heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain.'[1] All the Jewish horizon was involved in the gloom. It even spread a deep shade of the darkness over the Christian. Before the end of the first century, this heresy had already infected the Jews very deeply. Before the beginning of the second, it was conveyed by the Jews to the infant church of the Christians. The *first* Arians that ever existed under the gospel, were two *Jews*; and their names have been consigned to an infamous immortality, for the fact, Ebion and Cerinthus."[2]

But though Arius was not the original author of the principles to which his followers are attached, from his having been, perhaps, the ablest and most zealous advocate for them in the ancient church, their abettors have been known by his name; and the rise of the Arian controversy (as far as he is concerned) is referred, by some, to the year 316, by others to 319, by Baronius to 315, and by Basnage and others to the year 317.—*Socrates* gives this account of its origin: "Alexander," (bishop of Alexandria) he says, "discoursing one day too curiously concerning the doctrine of the Trinity in unity, in the presence of his presbyters and the rest of his clergy, Arius, one of the presbyters, supposed his bishop to advance the doctrine of Sabellius, and, disliking that, he went into an opinion directly opposite."[3]

[1] 1 Kings, xviii. 44, 45.

[2] Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism*, p. 411. 412.

[3] *Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. cap. 5.

Theodoret also says, that Arius took occasion, from things said by Alexander, to raise a disturbance;[1] and Constantine, likewise, in his letter to Alexander and Arius, first blames the former for putting questions to his presbyters which he ought not; and then the latter, for inconsiderately uttering notions that ought to have been buried in silence.

Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia,[2] a great favourite of *Constantia*, sister of the Emperor Constantine, and wife of *Licinius*, became a zealous promoter of Arianism. He took Arius under his protection, and introduced him to Constantia; so that the sect increased, and several bishops embraced it openly. It was however condemned, and its followers anathematized by a council at Alexandria, consisting of 100 bishops, in 320, under Alexander; who accused Arius of impiety, and caused him, and several ecclesiastics, of whom two were bishops, to be expelled from the communion of the church.[3] But, so far from being extinguished, it soon increased still more, and both parties became contentious and refractory; so that, in order to put an end to the disputes, and remedy the disorders which it occasioned,

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* lib. iv. cap. 1.

[2] Not the historian, though he also endeavoured to pacify Alexander, and to persuade him to compromise the quarrel.

[3] The two bishops who persisted in adhering to Arianism, and afterwards refused to subscribe the *Nicene* Creed, when drawn up, were *Thomas*, bishop of Marmorica, and *Secundus*, bishop of Ptolemais.

the emperor was obliged to assemble the Council of *Nice*, in Bythinia, (which was the first *General* Council,) where, in the year 325, the doctrine of Arius was again condemned by 318 bishops.[1] He himself was banished by the emperor, all his books were ordered to be burnt, and capital punishment was denounced against all those who should dare to keep them. But, after all, his doctrine was not yet extinguished; on the contrary, it became the reigning religion, especially in the East. After a few years banishment, he was recalled to Constantinople,[2] where he presented the emperor with a confession of his faith, drawn up so artfully that it satisfied him; and the laws that had been enacted against him were repealed. Notwithstanding this, *Athanasius*, then bishop of Alexandria, refused to admit him and his followers to communion; which so enraged them, that, by their interest at court, they procured that prelate to be deposed and banished, A. D. 335. But the church of Alexandria still refusing to admit Arius into their communion, the emperor sent for him to Constantinople; where, upon his delivering in a fresh confession of his faith, in terms still less offensive, the emperor ordered *Alexander*, the bishop of that

[1] The number of bishops assembled out of every region of the Christian world was 323. These, with only *five* dissentients at first, and only *two* at last, out of the whole number, drew up and subscribed the celebrated Confession of faith, well known by the name of the *Nicene Creed*.

[2] Some say in 327 or 328, others in 330.

church, to receive him into his communion, in 336; but, before this order could be put in execution, Arius died a tragical death; the occasion of which, whether by poison, or some other violence, has not been fully ascertained.[1]

But the heresy did not die with the heresiarch: his party continued still in great credit at court. Athanasius, indeed, was soon recalled from banishment, and as soon removed again; the Arians being countenanced by the government, and making and deposing bishops, as it best served their purposes. They found a protector in *Constantius*, the son of Constantine, and in several other of his successors, which sometimes occasioned great tumults in the empire; at other times, the opinions of the Christian world were found to fluctuate in compliance with the changing sentiments of its masters. Each party in turn, more especially the Arians, under the cruel and bigotted *Valens*, laboured to establish its victory by unjustifiable proceedings against the other.

The first formal persecution of Christians against one another, was in consequence of Arianism, which is said to have done more hurt to the church than all the ten persecutions to which it was exposed by the Heathen. The contentions and divisions of those who called themselves Christians, began, in the 4th century, to make them a reproach to the world.[2]

[1] See Dr M'Laine's note to Dr. Mosheim's *Eccl. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 418.

[2] Two Arians suffered under the writ "*De Hæret. comburendo,*" so late as in the reign of James I. of England.—Happily

The Arian doctrine, whose chief progress was in the East, soon branched out into various forms and subdivisions; and *Apollinaris*, in opposing it, fell into the contrary error of denying the *humanity* of Christ. The Arians underwent various revolutions, persecuting and oppressed, under succeeding emperors, according to the degree of interest which they had with the civil power, till at length Theodosius the Great exerted every possible effort to suppress and disperse them.—Their doctrine was carried, in the *fifth* century, into Africa, under the *Vandals*, and into Asia under the *Goths*; among whom it found a fixed residence, and a peaceful retreat.—Italy, Gaul, and Spain, were also deeply infected with it; and, towards the commencement of the *sixth* century, it was triumphant in many parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. However, when the Vandals were driven out of Africa, and the Goths out of Italy, by the arms of *Justinian*, it sunk almost at once; but it revived again in Italy under the protection of the *Lombards* in the *seventh* century, and was not suppressed till about the end of the *eighth*.

It was again revived in the West by *Servetus*, a native of Spain, who suffered death, in 1553, for a little tract which he published about 1531,

the use of fire and faggots, as arguments of conversion, are now laid aside, and it is to be hoped they will never be applied to again.—This law, however, first made in the reign of Henry IV., was not repealed till the year 1677; when the repeal was moved for by the Duke of York.—COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. II. p. 897.

against the Trinity, and which gave occasion, after his death, to the forming of a new sytem of Arianism in Geneva, more subtle and artful than his own, and which did not a little perplex Calvin.[1]—From Geneva the new Arians removed into Poland, where they gained considerable ground; but at length degenerated, in a great measure, as has been the case with most Arians since that time, into *Socinianism*.

Erasmus, it is thought, aimed at reviving Arianism, in his *Commentaries on the New Testament*;[2] and the learned *Grotius* seems to lean that way. Mr *Whiston*, the famous astronomer, and translator of Josephus, was one of the first divines who revived this controversy in the beginning of the last century.[3] He was followed by *Dr Samuel*

[1] Servetus rather appears to have been a *Photinian* than an Arian; and he had not, properly speaking, any disciples.

[2] When reproached, by his adversaries, with Arian interpretations and glosses, Arian tenets, &c., Erasmus's answer was,—"*Nulla hæresis magis extincta quam Arianorum.*"

[3] I am not aware when Arianism made its first appearance in Britain; but that it prevailed in England soon after the Reformation, appears from *Strype*, who, speaking of the transactions of 1550, remarks, that "Arianism now shewed itself so openly, and was in such danger of spreading farther, that it was thought necessary to suppress it, by using more rugged methods than seemed agreeable to the merciful principles of the professors of the gospel."—*Ecclesiastical Memoirs*, Vol. II. p. 214.

Accordingly we find the following injunction, or course of discipline, issued by the archbishops and bishops in 1560: "That incorrigible *Arians*, *Pelagians*, or *Freewill-men*, be sent into some one castle in *North Wales*, or *Walkingford*, and there to live of their own labour and exercise; and none other be suffered to

Clarke, the learned translator of Homer, who has been considered as at least a *Semi*-Arian. The Doctor was threatened by the Convocation, and seems to have betrayed more timidity, and less honesty, than Mr Whiston. He was also combated by argument; and his principal antagonist was Dr Waterland, who has been charged, by some, with verging towards *Tritheism*. *Dr Price*, an eminent dissenter, has appeared as an advocate for Arianism more lately, and has taken great pains to explain and defend its principles in his sermons on the *Christian Doctrine*. And perhaps its ablest defender, in the present day, is *Mr Benjamin Carpenter* of Stourbridge, in Worcestershire, who has once more directed the attention of the public to the Arian doctrine, after it had seemed to slumber for upwards of twenty years.

See Mr Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism disclosed*.—The history of this controversy, during the last century, may be found in a pamphlet entitled, *An Account of all the considerable Books and Pamphlets that have been written on either side, in the Controversy concerning the Trinity, from the year* 1712; *in which is also contained, An Account of the Pamphlets written this last year on each side by the Dissenters, to the end of the year* 1719: *published at London*, 1720.—See also a *History of Arianism*, in Dr Jortin's Works.

resort unto them but their keepers, until they be found to repent of their errors."

Arianism was then a general name for every opinion that opposed the Divinity of Christ.

DISTINGUISHING TENETS.—Arius owned Christ to be God in a subordinate sense, and considered his death to be a propitiation for sin; and his followers acknowledge that the Son was the *Word;* but they deny that word to have been eternal, contending, that it had only been created prior to all other beings. Christ, say they, had nothing of man in him, except the flesh, with which the λογος, or *word,* spoken of by St. John, was united, which supplied the rest, and was the same as the soul in us.[1]

Though they deny that Christ is the *Eternal God,* yet they contend against the Socinians for his *pre-existence,* which they found on our Lord's prayer,—"Glorify me with the glory which I had with thee *before* the world was;" and on this expression, which he uses on another occasion,—"*Before* Abraham was, I am." These, and many other texts of a similar kind,[2] are, in their opinion, undeniable proofs that Christ did actually exist in another state, before he was born of the Virgin Mary.

But, "whilst they all concur in maintaining

[1] See Dr Lardner's *Credibility,* &c. Vol. IX. b. 1. c. 69.

Some of the texts which they produce in proof of Christ's being not consubstantial with, but inferior and subordinate to, the Father, are,—St. Matth. xix. 17. xv. 32.; St. Mark, v. 7. &c.; Ephes. iv. 6.; St. Matth. xxvii. 46.; St. John, xx. 17.; St. John, xiv. 28.; St. Mark, xiii. 32.; Ephes. i. 17.; 1 Cor. xi. 3. and xv. 24. &c. &c.

[2] *Viz.* John, i. 1. 3.; iii. 13.; vi. 62.;—2 Cor. viii. 9.;—Eph. iii. 9.;—Heb. i. 2.;—Col. i. 15, 16.;—Philip. ii. 5—8.

the pre-existence of Christ as a super-angelic spirit, which supplied the place of a soul to him upon his conception and birth, and also his derivation from, and subordination to, the Father, some of them ascribe to him a higher degree, rank, and dignity, than others. Accordingly they have been sometimes distinguished into *High* and *Low* Arians.

"The *former*, approaching in opinion to those that have been called *Semi*-Arians,[1] or rather to the ancient Arians, whilst they believe the Father to be the one supreme God over all, absolutely eternal, underived, unchangeable, and independent; conceive the Son to be the first derived being from the Father, and under him employed in creating, and also in preserving and upholding, the world, and in exercising a moral, as well as natural, administration over mankind; so that, under this distinguishing character, he is invested with the office of final judge.

"Of these high Arians, some suppose, that Jesus Christ, sustaining relations, and exercising offices so honourable in themselves, and so interesting to mankind, is a proper object of subordinate worship; whilst others imagine, that worship, in the proper and discriminating sense of

[1] The Semi-Arians agreed with the Arians in rejecting the word ὁμοούσιος, but differed from them in carrying the perfections and the dignity of the Son higher than the Arians did, and in affirming that he was ὁμοιούσιος, of *like* substance, and *like* to his Father in all things.—Dr JORTIN'S *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* Vol. II. p. 51.

the term, belongs only to the Father, the self-existent, infinite, and supreme Deity.

"Some Arians of this class have maintained, that the Son of God, before his incarnation, had only, or chiefly, the care and government of the Jewish people allotted to him; whilst other angels were appointed presidents, or princes, of other nations and countries.

"This was the opinion of Mr James Pierce, an ingenious and learned commentator. See his *Paraphrase and Notes*, &c. on Coloss. ii, 15., and Heb. ii, 9.

"Others have also maintained, that the conduct of all the dispensations of Providence, in every period of time, as they related to the patriarchs, to the Jewish nation, to the prophets, to Christians, and to the world in general, has been entrusted to Christ; and that he was distinguished by various appropriate titles, as Jehovah, the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel Jehovah, the Angel of the Presence, and the Logos, &c. To this purpose they allege, among other arguments, the declaration of the apostle, (Heb. i. 2., ii. 3.) that it was by Christ God made the worlds, αιωνας, the ages, or dispensations, *i. e.* by whom God formerly disposed those eminent and remarkable periods of time,—the antediluvian, the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the present,—being put under his government, acccording to the will of the Father. See Ben Mordecai's *Apology*, Letter 2. *passim*. It is also alleged, as a further presumption in favour of this hypothesis, that the

sacred writings contain a revelation and history of the administration of Providence with regard merely to the inhabitants and concerns of our world, or of the terrestrial globe; and, of course, that the subordinate direction and superintendance of this part of the government of the supreme and infinite sovereign of this, and innumerable other worlds, is entrusted with Jesus Christ; a superior being, adapted by his pre-existent dignity, and extraordinary perfections and powers, to the office of ruler and judge.

The *Low*-Arians, on the other hand, are distinguished from the Socinians in no other respect, besides their maintaining the pre-existence, prior dignity, and transcendant native perfections, of that super-angelic spirit, which was united to the body of Christ, in his miraculous incarnation; but that he is entitled to no kind of religious worship, in the peculiar and appropriate meaning of this term."[1]

Hence, while the *High* Arians believe that Christ is the maker, preserver, and governor, of the world, these *Modern*[2] Arians do not admit that

[1] Dr Rees's *Cyclop.* Art. *Arians;* where may be seen an abstract of the real opinions of the ancient Arians, as they are given by Dr Cave, &c. in the words of Arius himself; and also further particulars on the general subject of this article.

[2] This, it seems, is a title by which the advocates of the hypothesis of the *simple pre-existence* of Christ are willing to be distinguished, as well as by that of *Unitarians.* Mr Belsham, who remarks of the doctrine of this class of Arians, that "it is the puny birth of the 18th century, and certainly can never live through the 19th," seems to think that the term *Unitarians*

he has any concern in its formation and government, or that he was, in former ages, the medium of divine dispensations to mankind.

The Arians believe that the Holy Ghost is not God, but the creature of the Son, begotten and created by him, and inferior in dignity to the Father and the Son.

In their doxologies they ascribe "Glory to the Father, through the Son." And it is worthy of notice, that the friends of Arianism drew up seventeen different confessions of faith, within forty years after they had rejected the *Nicene* doctrine; and, after all, would abide by none of them; and I am not aware that they have had, to this day, any stated Creed.

That adopted by Mr B. Carpenter, in his *Liturgy*, p. 50., "to be said by the minister and people," wants three articles, and is as follows:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord, who taught us the way of God in truth, and set us an example that we should follow his steps: who died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and the third day rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge both the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Spirit,—in the forgiveness of sins upon repent-

is far more appropriate to them than that of Arians, to which he will not allow that they have any right.

ance,—in the necessity of a holy and religious life, —in the resurrection of the dead,—and in a future state of rewards and punishments; and I believe that, in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

For that description of Arianism which is most recent, see the *Correspondence* between Dr Price and Dr Priestley; Dr Price's *Sermons;* Ben Mordecai's *Letters*, which are the grand text-book of Modern Arians; and Mr Benjamin Carpenter's *Lectures on the Works of Creation, and the Doctrines of Revelation*, 2 vols. 8vo.

Worship.—The first Arians were accused of idolatry, for worshipping him whom they accounted a creature; and the more modern Arians, in order to evade this accusation, have framed a distinction between supreme and inferior worship;[1] but this, like the Roman Catholic distinction of *Latreia* and *Doulia*, does not appear to others to have any foundation in Scripture.[2]

Whiston, Clarke, Emlyn, Chandler, Benson, Pierce, and Grove, in short, all the most eminent Arians, whether churchmen or dissenters, have been worshippers of Christ; but we are now told, that, "since the publications of Dr Price," the Arians "seem to have abandoned the worship of Jesus Christ," notwithstanding they still continue to believe that he is the Maker, Supporter,

[1] See Emlyn's *Vindication of the Worship of Christ.*

[2] See Rom. i. 25.; Gal. iv. 8., &c.

and Governor of the world, and the immediate dispenser of all things pertaining both to life and godliness.[1]

But though Dr Clarke continued to join in the worship of the Church of England, and even to take an active part in it, he thought he saw the necessity of reforming her liturgy; and accordingly, a short time before his death, he himself made and proposed some striking alterations, chiefly in the devotional parts, and with respect to the object of worship.

All those passages, in which the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* are called *God*, or divine worship ascribed to either of them, he took the liberty of striking out, or of changing them so as to direct the worship to God the *Father*. The title prefixed to this work, which I believe was never published, but may be seen in the *British Museum*, where it was lodged by his son, Mr Clarke, was, *Amendments, humbly proposed to the Consideration of those in Authority, of the Book of Common Prayer*, &c. I am not aware that the Common Prayer, with these alterations, has been used in any congregation of Arians; but it, or something on the same plan, seems to be loudly called for

[1] Mr Belsham's *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. p. 31. 78. "Though, among other things, he (Dr Price) differed from me with respect to *the person of* Christ, no man laid more stress than he did on his being a *creature* of God, equally with ourselves, and no more an *object of worship* than any other creature whatever."—Dr PRIESTLEY's *Discourse on the Death of Dr Price*, p. 25.

by Arians and Unitarians, both in and out of the church; and it forms the ground-work of the liturgy used since 1774 in the Unitarian Chapel, Essex Street, Strand.[1]

Mr B. Carpenter, in 1793, published, for the use of his congregation at Stourbridge, *A Liturgy, containing forms of Devotion for each Sunday in the Month, with an Office for Baptism, &c.*; which, he says, was "chiefly compiled from the SACRED SCRIPTURES, the Book of Common Prayer, and other liturgies." Whatever may be the practice in other Arian congregations, it appears, from the excellent address prefixed to this compilation, that a liturgy of any sort was then a novelty in Mr Carpenter's congregation, although its members had adopted the practice of *standing* whilst they sing the praises of God, of *kneeling* whilst they join in the prayers which are offered up, "of public instead of private baptism, and of having the Lord's Supper administered every month."—Mr Carpenter's object in drawing up this liturgy, seems to have been very comprehensive, for he wished to render it "unexceptionable to Christians of all persuasions!" Of course, it retains but little resemblance of *the Book of Common Prayer*. In his advertisement, also prefixed to it, Mr Carpenter remarks, that, "as we have

[1] A list of what Dr Clarke conceived to be the exceptionable parts, with respect to the object of worship, may be seen in Mr Lindsey's *Apology for resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire*, p. 185., &c.; or in the same author's *Conversations on Christian Idolatry*, p. 136., &c.

no divine precept" for addressing *prayer* to Christ,[1] "I think it right, in our public worship, to pray to the Father only, in the name of Christ. But, as praise is certainly ascribed to him in the Scriptures, and as love to Christ is made an essential branch of his religion, I cannot but think we are justified in addressing him with hymns of praise and thanksgiving."

Accordingly, hymns of praise are here addressed to the Redeemer at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, &c.

In the beginning of the litany, which is here transferred from the morning to the afternoon service, the joint invocation of the three persons of the Trinity is left out, and the *second* and *third* invocations, or addresses, are to the *Father*, and are thus expressed:—"Through the intercession of thy well-beloved Son, our Redeemer, have mercy upon us miserable sinners."—"By the direction and assistance of thy Holy Spirit, have mercy," &c.

Besides the Office for *Baptism*, mentioned in the title page, there is one for the *Lord's Supper*, and another for *the Burial of the Dead.*

The child is baptised "*into* the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit;" and in the administration of the Lord's Supper, I do not find any thing that can be called a prayer of *Consecration*, of *Oblation*, or of *Invocation*."[2]

[1] See below, p. 161.

[2] See the Liturgy itself, 12mo, sold by J. West, Stourbridge; T. Pearson, Birmingham; and R. Baldwin, Paternoster-Row.

PRESENT STATE, AUTHORS AND WORKS FOR AND AGAINST, &c.—Compared with what Arianism has been, what we now hear of it is but a faint echo, and daily growing fainter and fainter; most of those who now set out with Arianism, seem not satisfied with it, but, with the great Mr Chillingworth, slide down the precipice into *Socinianism* below. "The Arian opinions," says an author who was himself a professed Arian, and who, as such, has a peculiar claim to our confidence on *this* point, "are at present upon the decline, *many* Unitarian Christians tending fast to the doctrine of Socinus."[1]

"There are only three stages of declension from Christianity into Deism; *Mr Whiston* shewed himself very ready for the second, when, he dared to charge the Scriptures of God with weakness and with absurdity. Mr Chillingworth had finished two of them, when he died; and was ready, I fear, for the third. *Chubb* too, whose name was formerly of some notoriety in the lists of infidel fame, but is nearly lost and forgotten in the crowds upon the rolls at present, was *first* an Arian, *then* a Socinian, and *finally* a Deist. *Morgan* also, another phantom of unbelief, that once stalked about formidable in its nothingness, was

[1] Dr Kippis, in the *New Biog. Brit.* Vol. III. p. 623. The Doctor himself is said to have become a Socinian long before his death. Dr Priestley also acknowledges, that "it is very common, at this day, for persons to pass from Athanasianism to Arianism, and *then* from Arianism to proper Unitarianism."—*History of Early Opinions*, &c. Vol. IV. p. 235, 236.

a presbyterian minister, who *commenced* an Arian, and *concluded* an infidel."[1]

Dr Sykes, in his *Case of Subscription*, undertook to hold up the credit of Arian subscription to *Trinitarian* articles against Dr Waterland, who, for that subscription, charged the Arians with fraud and prevarication. And, since the middle of last century, the question concerning the divinity of our blessed Lord, has afforded matter for repeated and almost perpetual discussion. As it would be difficult, and indeed needless, to enumerate all the works that have appeared upon the subject, it may be sufficient that the most considerable part of them be mentioned here, and with reference, as far as may be, to the different periods and aspects of the controversy. "Those who disputed the supreme Godhead of Christ, were, for a time, chiefly of the Arian persuasion. This was the case with Mr Hopkins, a clergyman in Sussex, who published, without his name, *An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People, concerning an important Point of Doctrine, imposed upon their Consciences by the Authority of Church Government; and in particular to the Members of the Church of England.* In opposition to this work was printed *A sincere Christian's Answer to the Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People; in a Letter to the Appellant.* By the Reverend Thomas M'Donnell, D. D.—Mr Hopkins's treatise gave occa-

[1] Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism*, p. 498.

sion, we believe, to two or three other pieces in support of the common doctrine of the Trinity.

"The next important publication of the Arian kind, was the *Essay on Spirit;* ascribed to Dr Robert Clayton, bishop of Clogher, and which was the beginning of a considerable controversy. The productions of the bishop's antagonists were as follow: *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Clogher, occasioned by his Lordship's Essay on Spirit.—A Dissertation on the Scripture Expressions, the Angel of the Lord, and the Angel of Jesus Christ; containing a full Answer to a late Essay on Spirit.—An effectual and easy Demonstration, from principles purely philosophical, of the Truth of the sacred, eternal, coequal, Trinity of the Godhead;* by the Reverend John Kirkby.—*A second Letter, to the Bishop of Clogher.—An Answer to the Essay on Spirit;* by Thomas Knowles, M. A.—*A full Answer to the Essay on Spirit.* The writer of this tract was the Reverend Mr William Jones, who hath appeared since, upon various occasions, as a zealous advocate for the Trinity. *The Negative on that Question, Whether is the Arch-angel Michael our Saviour? examined and defended;* by Sayer Rudd, M D.—*A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the Exceptions of a late Pamphlet.—A second Vindication.* These two pieces were written by the late Dr Randolph. *The holy scriptural Doctrines of the divine Trinity in essential Unity, and of the Godhead of Jesus Christ;* by John Scott, D. D.—*An Essay towards an An-*

swer to a Book, entitled, an Essay on Spirit; by Dr M'Donnell.—*A short Vindication;* by the same author.

"On the bishop's side of the question appeared, *A Sequel to the Essay on Spirit;* by Mr Hopkins above mentioned.—*The Doctrine of the Trinity, as usually explained, inconsistent with Scripture and reason.*—*A Defence of the Essay on Spirit;*—and *A plain and proper Answer to the Question, Why does not the Bishop of Clogher resign his Preferments?*—The two last tracts are supposed to have been the productions of Dr Clayton himself. In this controversy, the books of principal importance were, on the one side, Mr Hopkins's *Sequel;* and, on the other side, Dr Randolph's *Vindications.*

"A more recent vindicator of the Arian hypothesis, was Mr Henry Taylor, in his *Apology of Benjamin Ben Mordecai to his Friends for embracing Christianity:* to whom may be added Dr Harwood, in his *Five Dissertations;* in the *first* of which he opposes the *Athanasian* Doctrine, and in the *second* the *Socinian* Scheme. Dr Price does the same, with regard to both these Schemes, in his Sermons on the *Christian Doctrine. A Defence of the Arian Hypothesis* may likewise be seen in the fourth volume of the *Theological Repository,* p. 153—163; and in Mr Cornish's Tract on the *pre-existence of Christ.*"[1]

[1] Dr Kippis's Note to Dr Doddridge's *Lectures,* Vol. II. p. 171, 172. To the above may be added, Mr Tomkin's *Je-*

According to Trinitarians, it is hard to say which of the two is the most unreasonable and unscriptural:—*Socinianism*, which never considers Christ as any thing but a *mere man;* or, *Arianism*, which never looks upon him as any thing but a *supposititious God*, "a deified creature, a visible and inferior Jehovah," (H. Taylor.) Between these two, in their opinion, lies the true Christian faith; which, as it allows him to be *perfect God, and perfect man*, is never offended, or put to its shifts, by any thing that the Scripture may have said about him, in either capacity.

sus Christ the Mediator, and, since Dr Kippis's death, Mr Carpenter's *Lectures*, lately printed, both of them on the Arian side; together with Mr Belsham's (an Unitarian) answer to this last work, in his *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. just published.

Mr Job Orton, the learned and pious author of the *Life of Doddridge*, &c. is said to have become an Arian sometime before his death; though he never wrote any thing expressly on the subject of the Trinity. And the Works of Mr Thomas Emlyn, repeatedly mentioned above, who was a native of Stamford, but for a long time a dissenting minister in Dublin, where he suffered much on the score of heterodoxy, were published in 3 vols. 8vo. by his son, Mr Sollom Emlyn, an eminent counsellor, with Memoirs of the Author, who died in 1741.

UNITARIANISM,

AND

UNITARIANS.

NAMES.—This sect received the name of *Socinians*, from Lælius and Faustus Socinus or Sozzini, uncle and nephew, of *Sienna* in Tuscany, who both taught the same doctrines; but the latter, who died in Poland in 1604, is generally considered its founder.—The modern Socinians, however, being strenuous advocates for the Divine Unity, now generally claim the appellation of *Unitarians*,[1] as more descriptive of their tenets

[1] Speaking for himself and his brethren, Mr Belsham says of the term *Socinians*:—"We do not answer to that name, nor do we approve of being distinguished by it. In the first place, because the doctrine we hold is not borrowed from Socinus, but is known, and universally allowed to have been coeval with the apostles. And, further, we differ very materially from the opinions of that very great and good man, and his immediate followers, who strangely imagined, that Christ, though a human

than that of Socinians, since they do not acknowledge all the doctrines of Socinus. But, although they claim this designation, it is not generally admitted by others, because they claim it as contrasted with that of *Trinitarians*. It may indeed distinguish them, except from Sabellians, and from Jews, Mohammedans, and Deists, as allowing only one person in the Divine Essence; yet they can lay no particular claim to the term among Christians, for it confounds them with Arians, and even Trinitarians, who are equally strenuous for the Divine Unity, and acknowledge, as well as they, "*that there is none other God but one.*"[1]—As they are zealous advocates for the *simple humanity* of Christ, or maintain, that our Saviour is merely a human being, some of them have taken the name of *Humanitarians*;[2] and we are told, that, in Wales, &c. they are also known by the name of *Priestleians*, from Dr Priestley, the modern Coryphæus of the sect.

being, was advanced by God to the government of the whole created universe, and was the proper object of religious worship.—We call ourselves *Unitarians*, or, to distinguish ourselves from other classes of Christians who assume that name, *proper*, or *original Unitarians*; and we regard ourselves as entitled to this distinction, from prescription, from the reason of the thing, and now from the custom of the language, *quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi.*"—Letters upon Arianism, &c. p. 25, 6.

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 4.

[2] This name is adopted by Mr B. Hobhouse, in his Reply to Mr T. Randolph.

RISE, PROGRESS, AND HISTORY.—It is difficult to trace the origin of this denomination. Many are inclined to think, that the doctrines by which its members are chiefly distinguished, were first maintained by *Paul* of Samoseta, who was bishop of Antioch about the middle of the 3d century, and by *Artemon*, his contemporary.

They themselves lay claim to a very high antiquity, and even venture to say, "that there is no such thing as a Trinitarian Christian mentioned, or supposed, in the New Testament; all there named being perfect Unitarians, the blessed Jesus himself, his apostles, and all his followers."[1]

Their sect may doubtless be traced to a very early period of the Reformation; and we are told by Mosheim, that they have been thought to have originated among the *Anabaptists;* a name by which those in Poland, who afterwards received the title of Socinians, were for some time known.[2]

John Campanus, and *Michael Servetus*, a Spanish physician whose unhappy fate is well known, who both flourished about the middle of the 16th century, were among the first of the Reformers

[1] Mr Lindsey's *Conversations on Christian Idolatry*, 8vo. 1792, p. 29.—See also Mr Belsham's bold assertion above, p. 146. Note.

[2] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 505. 509. "So early as the year 1524, the *Divinity* of Christ was openly denied by Lewis Hetzer, one of the wandering and fanatical *Anabaptists*, who, about three years afterwards, was put to death at *Constance*."—*Ibid.* p. 487.

who distinguished themselves as Anti-Trinitarians, and, according to some, in behalf of those doctrines which were afterwards embraced by L. and F. Socinus; under whom, particularly the nephew, the jarring opinions of their predecessors began to assume the appearance of a regular system.

A society near Venice, to which Lælius belonged, whose members discussed many points of religion, and particularly those relating to the Trinity, with great freedom, being discovered, and its members dispersed, they sought a refuge in Switzerland, Germany, Moravia, and other countries; while he escaped into Poland, in 1551, where he sowed the seeds of his doctrine, which grew apace, and produced a rich and abundant harvest.[1] His followers became, indeed, so nume-

[1] Such is the account of the origin of Socinianism, that is generally given by the writers of this sect, who date it from the year 1546, and place it in Italy; but Dr Mosheim, who partly rejects it, remarks, that the Socinians first formed themselves into a distinct congregation, or sect, in Poland, in 1565, when, in consequence of some violent contests between them and the Lutherans and Swiss Calvinists, with whom they had been principally connected, they were required, by a resolution of the diet of *Petrikow*, to separate from those denominations. The Doctor further remarks, that, till the date of this separation, the founders of the Socinian denomination "had not carried matters so far as they did afterwards; for they professed chiefly the Arian doctrine concerning the divine nature, maintaining, that the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* were two distinct natures, begotten by *God the Father*, and subordinate to him."—*Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. IV. p. 500.

rous and powerful, that they soon assumed almost the consequence of an establishment, under the protection of *Jo. Sienienius*, palatine of Podolia, who gave them a settlement in *Racow*, which he had just built in the district of *Sendomir*.[1]

In this station the Socinians enjoyed peace and prosperity, until towards the middle of the succeeding century, when, (in 1638,) owing to the imprudence of some of their students at *Racow*, in breaking a crucifix with stones, the terrible law was enacted by the Senate of Poland, by which, to appease the Roman Catholics, it was resolved, "that the academy of *Racow* should be demolished, its professors banished with ignominy, the printing-house of the Socinians destroyed, and their churches shut."—Yet these were but the beginning of evils to this society;—a still more terrible catastrophe awaited them; for, by a public and solemn act of the diet, held at Warsaw, A. D. 1658, they were banished for ever from the territory of Poland, and capital punishment was denounced against all those who should either profess their opinions, or harbour their persons.

In 1661 this cruel act was renewed; and all the Socinians that yet remained in Poland, were bar-

[1] Lælius, after travelling into different countries, where the Reformation was going forward, and revisiting Poland in 1558, settled at Zurich, in Switzerland, and died there A. D. 1562, in the thirty-seventh year of his age. His religious sentiments were propagated in a more public manner afterwards by Faustus, his nephew and heir, who is supposed to have drawn from his papers the substance of that religious system upon which this sect is founded.

barously driven out of that country, "some with the loss of their goods, others with the loss of their lives,—as neither sickness, nor any domestic consideration, could suspend the execution of that rigorous sentence."[1]

From Poland their doctrines had made their way into Hungary; and, about A. D. 1563, into Transylvania, where they were embraced by Sigismund, the reigning prince, and by many of the nobility, chiefly by the address and industry of *George Blandrata*, the prince's physician; and though they afterwards met with opposition from the *Batori*, who were chosen dukes of that country, yet they had there acquired so deep a root, that they never could be entirely eradicated.[2]

Hence, some of those unhappy exiles from Poland sought for a refuge among their brethren in *Transylvania*, while a considerable part of them were dispersed through the provinces of *Silesia*, *Brandenburg*, and *Prussia*; and in all these provinces their posterity are to be found at this day. Others went in search of a convenient settlement for themselves and their brethren, into *Holland*, *England*, *Holstein*, and *Denmark*, but with little success. Several other attempts also were made, in different countries, in favour of their peculiar doctrines; but the success of those who engaged in them is said to have been still less considerable: "nor could any of the European nations," says

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. V. p. 501.

[2] *Vide* Petr. Bod. *Historiam Unitariorum in Transylvania*, Lugd. 1781.

Dr Mosheim, "be persuaded to grant a public settlement to a sect whose members denied the divinity of Christ." [1]

Socinians were but little heard of in England till during the troubles in the reign of Charles I., when the famous John Biddle, who erected an independent congregation in London, adopted, and openly avowed, their tenets, for which he suffered various persecutions, and at last died in prison in 1662.

The same tenets were soon afterwards embraced by several others, particularly among the dissenters; but their abettors, in England, never made any figure as a community, until towards the end of the last century, when they began to increase, and to acquire some distinction, from the writings and influence of Dr Priestley and his associates.

"I have, indeed, no hesitation in stating it as my firm conviction," says Mr Belsham, "that, in consequence of his (Dr Priestley's) personal exertions, and his admirable writings, in connection with those of his able and learned associate in the same cause, the venerable Theophilus Lindsey, whom I am proud to call my revered friend, the number of converts to a pure and rational Christianity have been multiplied a hundred fold, and are daily increasing among all ranks of society." [2]

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. V. p. 503.

[2] *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. p. 38.

"We consider it as a very favourable symptom of the increase of pure religion in the present times, that Unitarian cha-

They are, notwithstanding, not only expressly excluded from the privileges conferred by the *Toleration Act*,[1] whereby the supreme powers of the kingdom have indulged other sects in the free exercise of their religion, but also by 9th and 10th of William III. c. 32., they are placed under the impending arm of a statute, yet unrepealed, by which it is enacted, that if any person educated in the Christian religion, or professing the same, shall by *writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any of the persons of the Holy Trinity to be God*, he shall, upon the first offence, be rendered incapable to hold any office, or place of trust; and, for the second, be rendered incapable of bringing any action, being guardian, executor, legatee, or purchaser of lands, and shall *suffer three years imprisonment without bail.*[2]

pels, and Unitarian preachers, are beginning to be diffused over the country."—*Critical Review*, August 1808, p. 434.

[1] Every person who claims the privileges of this act, is bound to make the following profession of his faith: "I A. B. profess faith in God the *Father*, and in *Jesus Christ*, his eternal Son, the true God, and in the *Holy Spirit*, *one God*, blessed for ever more; and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration."

[2] Dr Priestley, speaking of the penal laws which affect Unitarians, says,—"The act of William and Mary, which in part declares the doctrine of the divine unity to be *blasphemy*, only expresses the opinion of William and Mary, and of those English lords and commoners, who, if they may be said to have had any opinion at all about the matter, happened to think as William and Mary did. But what is that to the solemn declaration of God himself, which asserts *their* opinion to be impious and blasphemous."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. II. p. 594.

Dr Priestley, having met with much opposition, and perhaps with some ill treatment, in England, retired to America in 1794, where, in consequence of his exertions, in conjunction with those of his fellow labourer, Mr William Christie,[1] and others, some Unitarian congregations have been formed. But however much he may have been respected by many individuals in that country, it does not appear that he met with much success in his favourite object, the propagation of Unitarianism, or that his friends have much cause to boast of their triumphs in that quarter; for, on his arrival, he was excluded from almost every pulpit; and his congregation at *Northumberland*, in Pennsylvania, where he resided till his death in 1804, is said to have at no time exceeded thirty or forty persons. Nay more, he seems scarcely to have gotten without the reach of penal laws, even when seated in that land of religious liberty; for we are told there is a law in *Connecticut*, that "whosoever shall deny the existence of God, or the mystery of the blessed Trinity, or the divine truth of the Holy Scriptures, shall be held unfit for any public office, till he repent and acknowledge his error; and that, in case of relapse, after such repentance, he shall be put out of the protection of the law."[2]

The last attempt for the repeal of this law was made, I believe, in 1792.

[1] Formerly of *Montrose*, where he formed a small society of Unitarians, which has already disappeared.

[2] Duke de la Rochefoucault Liancourt's *Travels in America*, Vol. I. p. 526.

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINES.—The predecessors of the modern Unitarians generally believed in a Trinity of some kind or other; and the extreme of heresy among them seems to have been *Arianism*, till about the year 1566, before which time the denomination of *Socinian* was unknown: but after they became a distinct sect, it soon appeared that they had totally divested Jesus Christ of his divinity, and wholly forsaken the Arian doctrine. They also denied the plenary inspiration of the sacred writers, and insinuated that mistakes had crept into their writings: and, having proceeded thus far, they endeavoured to strip revealed religion of every circumstance not clearly intelligible by human reason; and hence some of their successors now affect to call themselves *Rational Christians*, and, in this country, *Rational Dissenters*.

With regard to the *grand* point on which they differed from other Christians, they maintained, that the *Father*, and he only, is truly and properly God;—that *Jesus Christ* had no existence whatsoever, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary;—and, that the *Holy Ghost* is no distinct person, but that the phrase is merely a figurative mode of expression, to denote the *power* or *energy* of God. They owned, that the name of God is given in the Holy Scriptures to Jesus Christ, but contended, that it is only a deputed title, which, however, invests him with a great authority over all created beings: they owned him to have been an extraordinary person, miraculously produced,

and commissioned as a divine teacher, in whom the prophecies relating to the Messiah were *completely*, though not *literally*, fulfilled. They admitted also the whole history of his ascension and glorification in its literal acceptation; but, believing him to be a mere man like ourselves, though endowed with a large portion of the divine wisdom, they asserted, that the only objects of his mission were,—to teach the efficacy of repentance, without any atonement or satisfaction, as a means of recovering the divine favour;—to exhibit, in his life and conduct, an example for our imitation;—to seal his doctrine with his blood;—and, in his resurrection from the dead, to indicate the certainty of our resurrection at the last day.—They affirmed, that nothing is requisite to make men objects of the divine favour, but such moral conduct as he has made them capable of.

Their doctrine respecting the atonement, is—"that God requires no consideration or condition of pardon, but the repentance of the offender; and that, consequently, the death of Christ was no *real* sacrifice for sin, but is called so in Scripture, merely in a *figurative* sense, by way of allusion to the Jewish sin-offerings; as our praises, and other good works, are called sacrifices, because they are something offered up to God."

With the Pelagians of old, they denied the necessity of divine grace;—they also exploded the doctrines of original sin, predestination, and our Saviour's mediation, and reckoned the sacraments

nothing more than simple ceremonies, unaccompanied by any inward operations. We are told by Vossius,[1] that F. Socinus wrote a treatise on baptism, which he considers as a visible ceremony, admitting men into Christianity when they have been Jews, or Pagans, "but not to be used in a family *already* Christian."

Some of them likewise maintained the sleep of the soul, which, they say, "becomes insensible at death, and is raised again with the body at the resurrection, when the good shall be established in the possession of eternal felicity, while the wicked shall be consigned to a fire that will not torment them eternally, but for a certain duration, proportioned to their demerits."

Such were the principles of the more ancient Socinians: there is, however, a considerable difference of opinion between them and the modern Unitarians; for, while the latter hold all these articles, or the substance of them, one or two excepted, they have adopted several alterations in regard to some of them, and have also made considerable additions to their Creed. Thus, they believe the Scriptures to be faithful records of past transactions, but deny that their authors

[1] *De Baptismo.*

Accordingly Dr Priestley thinks it necessary to account for their still using it, which he does by saying, that they "baptize children, more from the influence of settled *custom*, and through a desire of avoiding all disturbance, than from any fixed persuasion that they are under an obligation to baptize them."—*History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, Vol. II. p. 94.

were divinely inspired as writers; and they reject the *miraculous conception*, and the *worship of Christ*, both of which were held by Socinus.[1]

The Socinians also believed, that although Jesus had no existence before his birth, yet that, since his resurrection, he has been advanced to the government of the universe; "a notion unscriptural, and most incredible," in Mr Belsham's opinion, who adds, that "a consistent Unitarian, acknowledging Jesus as a man in all respects 'like to his brethren,' regards his kingdom as entirely of a spiritual nature, and as consisting in the empire of his gospel over the hearts and lives of its professors."[2]

Modern Unitarians "allow the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament in no cases

[1] Socinus held, that the lordship and dominion ascribed to Christ, in the Scriptures, implied and authorized the worship of him, by prayer; and even condemned those who did not worship him. But the modern Arians and Unitarians, considering worship as due only to God, attempt to explain, in a way consistent with their own systems, the many passages of Scripture in which worship appears to be given to Christ.

[2] *Review* of Mr Wilberforce's *Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians*, p. 74.

But does not the following expression, used by Dr Priestley, seem to imply, that he held the above Socinian notion, however unscriptural and incredible? Speaking of Christ, he says,—"Though he reigns, he only reigns in subordination to that great Being who put all things under his feet, and to whom he must at length resign his delegated authority, that God, the only living and true God, even the Father, may be all in all; 1 Cor. xv. 28."—Sermon *on Undertaking the Pastoral Office at Birmingham*, 1780.

where they do not themselves expressly claim it; and are not sparing of the labour necessary to distinguish, even in the canonical books, what is of divine authority, from that which is of human origin."[1]

[1] Mr Belsham's *Review*, &c., p. 28.

In the third volume of the *Theological Repository* may be seen a tract by Dr Priestley, entitled, *Observations on the Reasoning of St. Paul*, which he considered as *inconclusive* in some places! Dr Lardner's disapprobation of this tract was the occasion of its being suppressed for some time.—Bishop Horsley has furnished Dr Priestley's friends with a strong argument, if they choose to lay hold of it, for proving a striking resemblance between his writings and those of this apostle; for the Bishop has remarked, that the Doctor's reasoning is inconclusive in *many* places.

Perhaps one of the passages that struck the Bishop as less conclusive, was the following, wherein the Doctor, speaking of the introduction to St. John's Gospel, says, that apostle "affirms that the Logos was not a being distinct from God, but God himself, *i. e.* (adds the Doctor,) *an attribute of God*, or the divine power and wisdom!" &c.—*History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, Vol. I. p. 11.

Both the affirmation and explanation here seem to speak against Dr Priestley; and had St. John himself thus explained his own doctrine, would not the Doctor have had cause to look upon *his* reasoning also as *inconclusive*?

But indeed the other apostles, it seems, were not "a whit behind" St. Paul in this respect; for we are told, it was the Doctor's opinion, that "they would sometimes, like other men, be liable to reason inconclusively." And "that they did so sometimes, must be allowed from the manifest differences of opinion among each other, on some of the less important points of Christian practice and doctrine."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. I. p. 475.

Hence they do not believe in our Lord's *Miraculous Conception*, but are of opinion, that he was the legitimate Son of Joseph and Mary; and Dr Priestley has taken the liberty of wholly rejecting the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, wherein that doctrine is taught:[1] and also, of maintaining the consequence of this opinion, viz. that what was born of Mary was *not* an "holy thing,"[2] but was "naturally as *fallible* and *peccable* as Moses, or any other prophet!"

Their hypothesis of the partial inspiration of the writers of the New Testament, he extends not only to Moses, but even to our blessed Lord himself; for he saw no reason, we are told, "for believing, that either Moses, or Jesus Christ, were inspired with supernatural knowledge, or endued with supernatural power, beyond the immediate objects of their missions. When the reason and the occasion ceased, the supernatural gifts would

[1] Mr Levi remarks, that the Miraculous Conception hangs about Dr Priestley's neck "like a mill-stone;" and tells him, that, in order to get rid of that doctrine, he is "obliged to deprive the Evangelists of the gift of inspiration, and reduce them to the level of mere historians."—*Letters to Dr Priestley*, Second Series, p. 69, 70.

On considering the liberties thus taken with Scripture by Unitarians, their opponents may well address them in the language of an ancient father,—"Apertè dicite non vos credere Christi Evangelio, nam qui in Evangelio quod vultis creditis, quod non vultis creditis, *vobis* potius quam Evangelio creditis."—*Aust. Contra Faust.* lib. 17. c. 3.

[2] St. Luke, i. 35.

cease too. They were given for a certain purpose: we are not warranted, therefore, in extending them beyond the occasion that called them forth."[1]

But does not this imply, that God gave the spirit *by measure* unto him? and if so, how does it accord with St. John, iii. 34., to say nothing of some other texts?

In withholding worship from Christ, the Unitarians doubtless act more consistently with their principles, and in a more rational manner, than their predecessors, who worshipped a person whom they conceived to be a mere man like themselves. Mr Lindsey tells us, that he thereby means no "want of respect to that kind Saviour of men," whom, he trusts, he "is disposed to love and honour, now and for ever, with the affection and reverence so justly due to him, for his perfect virtue and benevolence." "But," adds he, "I cannot make him the supreme God, or invoke, or pray to him, as such; because I am persuaded, that if he could hear, and make himself known to me, he would call out from heaven, as he did formerly to Paul,—'I am Jesus of Nazareth;' one who was once a mortal man like thyself: worship God."[2]

[1] *Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. I. p. 474.

[2] Mr Belsham accounts for their not giving religious worship to Christ, also on other grounds, viz. from their being "totally ignorant of the place where he resides, and of the occupations in which he is engaged."—"Jesus is indeed now alive," says he, "and, without doubt, employed in offices the most honourable

"The Unitarians believe, upon grounds common to all Christians, that Jesus of Nazareth was a divinely commissioned teacher of truth and righteousness; and that, having been publicly crucified by his enemies, he was raised from the dead on the third day.

"They regard it as an indispensible duty to believe, whatever he was commissioned to teach. And particularly, upon the evidence of his doctrine and resurrection, they expect a general resurruction of the dead, 'both of the just, and of the unjust;' and a subsequent state of retribution, in which all shall be treated in exact correspondence with their moral characters.

"The Unitarians believe Jesus to have been a man, for the same reasons for which they believe

and benevolent; but, as we are totally ignorant, &c. there can be no proper foundation for religious addresses to him, nor of gratitude for favours now received, nor yet of confidence in his future interposition in our behalf. All affections and addresses of this nature are unauthorized by the Christian revelation, and are infringements upon the prerogative of God."—*Review of Mr W's. Practical View*, p. 85.

On the other hand, that Jesus Christ is the object of religious adoration and invocation, and that supreme worship is ascribed to him jointly with God the Father, are warmly maintained by *Trinitarians*, who refer, in proof, to various texts of Scripture: as to—1 Thess. iii. 11.; 1 Tim. i. 2.; 2 Tim. i. 2.; Titus, i. 4.; 2 Cor. i. 2.; Eph. i. 2.; Gal. i. 3.; Eph. vi. 23.; Philem. 3.; Rom. x. 13.; Col. iii. 24.; 2 Thess. iii. 16.; Acts, vii. 59., and ix. 14. Compare St. Matth. iv. 10., with St. John, v. 23., and Heb. i. 6.—See Mr G. SHARP's *Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament*, 3d edit. 1803.

the proper humanity of Peter and Paul, of Moses and Abraham. He appeared as a man, he called himself a man, he was believed by all his companions and contemporaries to be a man; he had all the accidents of a man,—he was born, he lived, he eat and drank, and slept; he conversed, he rejoiced, he wept, he suffered, and he died as other men.

"That he was nothing more than a man, possessed of extraordinary powers, and invested with an extraordinary divine commission, and that he had no existence previous to his birth, they believe, simply upon this ground, that there is no evidence to prove the contrary. It is not incumbent upon them, nor do they pretend, to produce proof, that a person who appeared as a man was really such. If any maintain, that Jesus of Nazareth was something more than a human being, whether an angelic, super-angelic, or divine person, it is their business to prove their assertion."[1]

[1] Mr Belsham's *Review of Mr W.'s Practical View*, p. 270, 271.—"Evidence, such as it is," adds Mr Belsham, "has been produced; and it consists of certain texts of Scripture, chiefly taken from the New Testament, which are thought to teach, or to imply, the doctrine: Now, the Unitarians pledge themselves to shew, that all these passages are either interpolated, corrupted, or misunderstood."—All this they may do, but not, it is suspected, to the satisfaction of their opponents, who are fully confident in the truth of their doctrine, and in the force of the evidence which they bring to support it. And, as Unitarians will not listen to the evidence and the arguments of Christians, they may be referred to those of a *Jew* in their behalf, who, of course, must be allowed to be an impartial arbitra-

In this scheme of theology, along with our Lord's divinity, and the distinct personal existence of the Holy Ghost, the doctrines of *original sin*, and the *atonement*, also fall to the ground. Dr Priestley tells us, that the consequence of his labours in pursuit of "more definite ideas on this subject of the atonement was, what he had no apprehension of when he began the work, viz. a full persuasion that the doctrine of the atonement, even in its most qualified sense, had no countenance either from Scripture or reason;—that, from a full view of all religions, ancient and modern, they will be found destitute of any thing like the doctrine of proper atonement;"—and, further, that, considering that doctrine "in a practical view, he thinks the belief and influence of it unfavourable to virtue and morals!"

According to him, the pardon of sin is represented in Scripture, "as dispensed solely on account of men's personal virtue, a penitent upright heart, and a reformed exemplary life, without the least regard to the sufferings or merit of any being whatever."[1]

tor, or, if biassed, it must be against those who hold the Deity of Christ, he being himself an *Unitarian*.—See Mr Levi's Letters to Dr Priestley. The title of Mr Levi's 1st Letter to the Doctor in 1789, in answer to his second address to the Jews, is this,—"The *Divinity* of Christ, and his *Pre-existent* State, proved to be taught in the Gospels; and, consequently, whoever does not believe the same, is not entitled to the appellation of a *Christian*."

[1] *Theological Repository*, Vol. I., and *Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. II. p. 562, 572. Such is the answer that Dr Priest-

Having rejected the personal existence of the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to sanctify the heart, it is natural to suppose, that the Unitarians would also reject the doctrine of a divine influence upon the mind for moral and religious purposes. Accordingly Dr Priestley tells us, that, at an early period of his theological career, and while he was yet an *Arian*, he became "persuaded of the falsity of the doctrine of atonement, of the inspiration of the authors of the books of Scripture *as writers*, and of *all idea of supernatural influence*, except for the purpose of miracles."[1]

And Mr Belsham even ventures to say, "it has never yet been proved, that any supernatural influence upon the mind is necessary under the divine government, or that it has ever existed, except in a few very extraordinary cases."[2]

Such are the grand and leading doctrines of the Unitarian system.—Several other dogmas are maintained by most Unitarians, as the rejection—

ley is pleased to give to that most important enquiry, δος πυ στω, or, in the language of Scripture, "What must I do to be saved?"—On the other hand, see Mr Jerram's *Letters on the Atonement*, 8vo, 1804, and the elaborate and masterly work on the same subject, by Dr Magee.

[1] *Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. I. p. 35.

"Profectò minimè mirum est, si qui Christo gloriam naturalem, hoc est, veri nominis Deitatem, sustulerunt, iidem et officia ipsius imminuunt, et beneficia ipsius præcipua recusant agnoscere."—GROTIUS *De Satisfac. Christi in finem.*

[2] *Review of Mr W.'s Practical View*, p. 77.

of the existence and agency of the devil;—of the spirituality and separate existence of the soul;—of an intermediate state between death and the general resurrection;—and, *of the eternity of future punishment:* but these, not being essentially connected with their system, and being held by them in common with some others, ought not to be viewed, exclusively, as Unitarian doctrines. The same remark should also extend to the doctrines of *Necessity and Materialism;* for though both of these, particularly the former, are held by the most distinguished Unitarians of the present day, Mr Belsham insists, that they have no more connection with their peculiar Creed "than they have with the mountains in the moon."[1]

Mr Belsham tells us, that "the existence of an evil spirit is no where expressly taught as a doctrine of revelation;" and, with that openness and candour which seem to be natural to him, he also says, that he, for one, is not ashamed to avow, that he regards the notion of a devil, and his agency, "as an evanescent prejudice which it is

[1] Dr Priestley, it seems, thought otherwise; and therefore, as Mr Belsham is of opinion, that the doctrine of *Necessity* is "more connected with *Calvinism* than with *Unitarianism*;" and as the doctrines in question, with whatever other doctrines they may be connected, are connected with each other, a brief account of them, which will no doubt be expected in a work of this nature, may not stand much out of place, if introduced as an Appendix to *Unitarianism*, and an Introduction to *Calvinism*. See below.

now a discredit to a man of understanding to believe." [1]

The outcry that was raised against Dr Priestley, on his having expressed "some doubt of the immateriality of the sentient principle in man," led him "to give the closest attention to the subject; and," he himself tell us, "the consequence was, the firmest persuasion that man is wholly *material*, and that our only prospect of immortality is from the Christian doctrine of a resurrection. I therefore digested my thoughts," adds he, "on the subject, and published my *Disquisitions relating to Matter and Spirit*; also the subjects of *Socinianism* and *Necessity* being nearly connected with the doctrine of the *materiality* of man, I advanced several considerations from the state of opinions in ancient times in favour of the former; and, in a separate volume, discussed more at large what related to the latter." [2]

"His opinions respecting the soul, of course, led him to disbelieve the doctrine of an *intermediate state*. Believing that as the whole man died, so the whole man would be called again to

[1] *Review of Mr W.'s Practical View*, p. 47.

A learned opponent of Dr Priestley, when speaking of his doctrine on this head, which wholly accords with that of Mr Belsham, ironically asks, whether the Doctor does not deserve our thanks for his generosity? Since, "as he bereaves us of that gracious Angel who is able to *save*, he endeavours to rid us of that evil one who has been generally viewed as the instrument in *punishing*."

[2] *Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. I. p. 80.

life at the appointed period of the resurrection of all men, he regarded the intermediate portion of time as a state of utter insensibility: as a deep sleep, from which the man would awaken, when called on by the Almighty, with the same associations as he had when alive, without being sensible of the portion of time elapsed."[1]

With regard to the doctrine and the *duration of future punishments*:—Dr Priestley, we are told, "had no notion of punishment, as such in the common acceptation of the term. The design of the Creator, in his opinion, was the ultimate happiness of all his creatures, by the means best fitted to produce it." Punishment he considered to be merely "the *medicina mentis* exhibited for our good by the Physician of Souls. Nor have we any reason to believe, that it is greater in degree, or longer in duration, than is necessary to produce the beneficial effect for which it is inflicted. It is the sort of punishment which a kind but wise parent inflicts on a beloved child."

[1] Dr Price also, though no materialist, nor an Unitarian, at least in the same sense of the word as Dr Priestley was, seems to have been of the same opinion on this head. Speaking of him, Dr Priestley remarks, that "though he held the opinion of a *soul* distinct from the body, we were both agreed in its being the clear doctrine of the Scriptures, that there is no state of perception, or action, between death and the general judgment. This interval he fully expected to pass, as in a profound sleep, and not to awake, but (to adopt the figurative language of Scripture,) at the sound of that trumpet which shall awake us all," &c.—*Discourse on the Death of Dr Price*, p. 25.

"At one time, indeed, he seems to have entertained the opinion, that annihilation might possibly be the lot of the wicked; but deeper reflection, and the fair results deducible from his metaphysical, as well as his theological system, altered his opinion. Trusting, therefore, to that pre-eminent and delightful attribute of the Deity, —that attribute to which wisdom and power are but the handmaids, the Divine BENEVOLENCE, he did not doubt but the ultimate result of the system would be permanent happiness to every intelligent being it embraces, though through different trials, at different periods, and perhaps in different degrees.—This doctrine he found as conformable to the Scriptures as it is to just notions of the goodness of God; and it seems to furnish a glorious exposition of that cheering passage, GOD IS LOVE."[1]

[1] *Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, V. I. p. 476., &c.

Hence we find the Doctor occasionally preaching in "the church of the *Universalists* at Philadelphia." And, during his last illness, he recommended to his son, Simpson's work *On the Duration of Future Punishment*, saying, "It contains my sentiments; and a belief in them will be a support to you in the most trying circumstances, as it has been to me. We shall all meet finally: we only require different degrees of discipline, suited to our different tempers, to prepare us for final happiness."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. I. p. 217.

All this is highly plausible, and, no doubt, very grateful to the ear of every impenitent sinner; but what if it should be found not to be conformable to the Scriptures, when "critically examined, and judiciously explained?" In that case, it must rest solely on the Doctor's *Metaphysics*, and on his unscriptural, and therefore *un*just, notions of the Goodness of God.—See the Article *Universalists*, in the last volume of this work.

On other points it is no easy matter to ascertain, what the Unitarians believe, or what they reject, for they seem to have no fixed principles; and Dr Priestley candidly tells us, in his *Defence of Unitarianism* for 1787, that he "does not know when his creed will be fixed."[1]

Mr Belsham also, in the introduction to his *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. just published, remarks, that having begun to think, he knows not where to stop, as he still professes to seek after knowledge, and is very far from flattering himself that he approaches the confines of discoverable truth.

In the mean time, they strive to persuade others, that the more they inquire into the grounds of their faith, their satisfaction increases, and the stronger becomes their conviction of the truth of their peculiar principles. They profess to be universally friends to a careful, diligent, and critical study of the Scriptures; and to rest their cause upon the Scriptures critically examined, and judiciously explained.[2]

[1] Among other dogmas unnoticed above, Dr Priestley held, that our blessed Lord preached only *one* year and a few months; and that sacrifices "were not, in their origin, of divine institution, but took their rise from the corporeal ideas men had of God in early ages in the infancy of the world, and were offered as *gifts, presents, entertainments*, or circumstances accompanying an address to the Deity; Psalm i. 8.," &c.—*Memoirs*, p. 558. and 605.

[2] The works noticed by Mr Belsham, as having been of most service in promoting the true knowledge of the Scriptures, are those of—*Locke, Taylor, Pierce, Lardner, Benson, Jebb, Wake-*

With regard to their moral code, the principles of the Unitarians do not seem to admit their loosening, in the least, the bonds of duty. On the contrary, they appear to be actuated by an earnest desire to promote practical religion. The practice of virtue is represented by them, as the only means of attaining happiness, both here and hereafter; and they teach, that the Christian religion "requires the absolute renunciation of every vice, and the practice of every virtue." Love is, with them, the fulfilling of the law; and the habitual practice of virtue, from a principle of love to God, and benevolence to man, is, in their judgment, "the sum and substance of Christianity."[1]

field, *Evanson*, *Lindsey*, *Priestley*, &c.—Review of Mr W.'s Practical View, p. 206.

But a captious adversary will be apt to remark here, that the specimen already given (see above, p. 159.) of the last of these as an expositor, does not seem to promise well either for him or the rest; and that he is disposed to estimate their success, and the advantages which they derive from their study of the Scriptures, by what Mr G. Blount, one of their party, learnt "by a diligent and careful study of the Bible," viz. "that moral and practical Christianity is the only Christianity contained in the Scriptures."—*Six more Letters to G. Sharp, Esq.*, p. 171.

[1] Mr Belsham's *Review*, p. 104. 125. and 251.

I have great pleasure in referring the reader, on this head, to Bishop Burnet's Address to the Clergy of the Diocese of *Sarum*, prefixed to his *four Discourses*. "I must also," says the Bishop, "do this right to the *Socinians*, as to own, that their rules in morality are exact and severe; that they are generally men of probity, justice, and charity, and seem to be very much in earnest in pressing the obligations to very high degrees of virtue.

Yet, after all, the Unitarians hold so few opinions which are peculiarly Christian, that many will not allow them to be reckoned among Christian sects, but would class them with Jews, Mohammedans, and Deists, with whom they hold common principles. But should they not have forfeited all right to be ranked among Christians, if their religion be not, what Bishop Warburton regarded it, "a sort of infidelity in disguise," nor altogether what Mr Wilberforce represents it, as a "sort of *half-way house* from nominal orthodoxy to absolute infidelity;" it is at least, in the opinion of most Christians, what Mrs Barbauld is said to have called it, "*Christianity in the Frigid Zone:*" nor do their doctrines seem to be tenable on the ground of their moral tendency, when compared with those of a more orthodox description. Morality, however excellent as a rule of life, will not become a *living principle* in the heart of man, if it be not mixed with faith, in those who are instructed in it; and, notwithstanding Mr G. Blunt may have overlooked the passage, it is expressly declared in the Bible, that "*without faith it is impossible to please God.*"[1]

With regard to their standards:—The first summary of their religious doctrine was published at *Cracow*, in the year 1574, under the title of *The*

Yet their denying all secret assistances, must cut off the exercises of many devotions," &c. &c. p. 3.; where he goes on to shew the great failure of many of their opinions, in point of moral tendency.

[1] Heb. xi. 6.

Catechism or Confession of the Unitarians;[1] but this, being merely a rude and incoherent sketch, and containing doctrines somewhat different from those that were soon afterwards embraced by the sect, was altered and improved by F. Socinus, and the other Socinian doctors, and was thus published under the title of the *Racovian Catechism*, or *Catechism of Racow:*[2] and the principal works of their most able writers were collected and republished in 1656, in 6 volumes folio, under the title of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*[3] What is published in this large collection, though it does by no means contain all the pieces of their best writers, is sufficient to give the attentive reader a clear idea of the doctrine of the Socinians, and of the nature of their institution as a

[1] The author of this Catechism was the famous *George Schoman;* and some account of its form and matter may be seen in Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 504, &c. Note (z.)

[2] It is worthy of remark, that this Catechism, though generally looked upon as the great standard of Socinianism, and an accurate summary of the Socinian doctrine, is in reality no more than a collection of the popular tenets of the Socinians, and by no means a just representation of the secret opinions and sentiments of their doctors: nor did it ever obtain the authority of a public confession, or rule of faith. The best and most approved edition is said to be that published in 1680, with notes, composed by, or extracted from, their best writers. A new edition of it, with an able refutation of its doctrine, was published in 8vo, at Francfort and Leipsick, in the year 1739, by the learned *G. Lewis Oeder.*

[3] Some account of the several authors of this collection, and also of the persecution of *Francis David*, for refusing to worship Christ, &c. will be found in Dr Toulmin's *Life of Socinus.*

religious community. An abstract of the faith and principles of the Unitarians in Transylvania was published in 1787, with permission of their government, by Professor *Markos* of the Unitarian College of *Clausenburg*:[1] and the principles of those in England and America are fully detailed in the voluminous writings of Priestley, Lindsey, and Belsham.

WORSHIP, RITES, AND CEREMONIES.—It has been already observed, that the modern Unitarians, with perhaps more consistency than their predecessors, reject the worship of Christ; and, as they deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, and call him merely a *property*, or *virtue*, the only object of their religious worship is *God the Father*.[2]

They reject every thing in Christianity that has but the appearance of mystery, or that surpasses the limits of human comprehension, and they may be said to allow but one ceremonial precept of Christ,—"an injunction to break bread:"—and neither seeing nor feeling any need of divine grace to enable them to will and to do what is necessary, on their part, towards their salvation, they, of

[1] This work of Professor Markos is entitled, *Summa Universæ Theologiæ Christianæ secundum Unitarios in usum Auditorum concinnata et edita; Cum Privilegio S. C. R. A. Maj. Claudiopoli Typis Collegii Reformatorum*, 1787.

[2] Their friends, the *Critical Reviewers*, tell us, that they "worship, as Christ himself did, one only God."

course, do not seek for it in the use of the sacraments, and other appointed means.——

" Bound on a voyage of awful length,
And dangers little known,
A stranger to superior strength,
Man vainly trusts his own.
But ours alone can ne'er prevail
To reach the distant coast;
The breath of heav'n must swell the sail,
Or all the toil is lost."——COWPER.

Mosheim remarks, in his account of the last century, that " the Socinians, who were dispersed through the different countries of Europe, have never hitherto been able to form a separate congregation, or to celebrate publicly divine worship, in a manner conformable to the institutions of their sect; though it is well known, that, in several places, they hold clandestine meetings of a religious kind." [1]

The learned Doctor should, doubtless, have excepted those in Transylvania, who have long had separate congregations, and have upwards of 160 at this day. I have not as yet met with any account of their form of worship; it is however, most likely, much the same as that adopted by the Protestant churches on the continent.

The worship of the Unitarians in England and America is, in general, liturgical, or conducted by forms. [2]

[1] *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. VI. p. 39.

[2] " He never, I believe, either prayed or preached *extempore*." *Summary of* Dr Priestley's religious opinions, in the first vo-

The form prepared by Mr Lindsey in 1774, for the use of his congregation in the Unitarian Chapel, Essex Street, Strand, is *The Book of Common Prayer, reformed according to the plan of the late Dr Samuel Clarke;* or, as it is expressed in the *Advertisement* prefixed to it, the "Liturgy of the Church of England, with the amendments of Dr Clarke, and such further alterations as were judged necessary, to render it unexceptionable with respect to the OBJECT of religious worship."

This form, which has already gone through five or six editions, contains almost all the Offices in the *Book of Common Prayer*, except the *Order of Baptism for those of riper years, and the Comination;* and in some of them, as *The Thanksgiving of Women after Child-birth, and the Burial of the Dead*, but few alterations are made: the grand object in the publication of it, being plainly to address the whole worship to God the Father, and thereby to avoid that idolatry which,

lume of *Memoirs* of his life, &c. p. 480.—"In prayer," says the Doctor, "every word should be such as all persons may, without scruple, make use of, because they are supposed to adopt it, and thereby make it their own; and to be employed in selecting what they can use, and what they cannot, would be to interrupt and spoil the effect of their devotion."—Introduction to his *Forms of Prayer*, &c. p. 32.

O si sic omnia!

Had Dr Priestley been equally orthodox in regard to every point of doctrine, discipline, and worship, his talents might have raised him to the highest situation in the church.

the Unitarians conceive, has long corrupted almost the whole mass of Christianity, and particularly the Church of England;[1] and which mars all the odour of the incense of her devotions.

The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony, might perhaps have been left out; as, by the law of England, no dissenters, except the Quakers, are permitted to solemnize it.

Mr L. has subjoined to it a very excellent "Exhortation to the parties after marriage;" but whether this should have more weight with them, and make a deeper and more lasting impression, than the texts of Scripture which close that ceremony in the *Book of Common Prayer*, I leave the reader to judge.

In the beginning of the Litany, which seems to be here used only "on such days as the Lord's Supper is administered," the Deity is, indeed, three times invoked, but the *joint* invocation of the three persons of the Trinity is left out, and the second and third invocations, or addresses to the Father, are expressed in these words:— "O God, who, by the precious blood of thy only begotten Son, hast purchased to thyself an holy

[1] "If," says Dr Priestley, "we take in every thing relating to doctrine, discipline, and method of worship, I think there is no sect or denomination among us, that is not nearer to the standard of the gospel, than the established church."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, vol. ii. p. 538.

church, and placed it under thy continual protection, have mercy upon us miserable sinners." —" O God, who, by thy holy spirit, dost govern, direct, and sanctify the hearts of all thy faithful servants, have mercy," &c.[1]

In the room of the doxologies proposed by Dr Clarke, the following is introduced:—" Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory, through Jesus Christ, for ever and ever. Amen;" from 1 Tim. i. 17. and Rom. xvi. 27.

Children are baptized, as by Mr Carpenter, " *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;"[2] and in the form of administra-

[1] From these, and some other parts of this Liturgy, it would appear that Mr L. had not quite rejected every idea of the *atonement*, and of the necessity of *divine influence*; and that he had not kept pace with Dr Priestley in every stage of his career towards *Proper* and *Original* Unitarianism.—Thus, he retains the article in the Creed that refers to our Lord's *Miraculous Conception*;—the deprecation in the Litany, wherein we pray to be delivered " from the deceits of the world, the flesh, *and the Devil*;"—the phrase, in the funeral service, " deliver us not into the bitter pains *of eternal death*," &c. &c.

[2] Dr Priestley, who conceives that neither our blessed Lord, nor his Apostles, prescribed any particular *form of words* for baptism, thinks it sufficient to baptize in the name of *Christ only*; and directs the person officiating, to say, (as he sprinkles the child with water, or immerses it, at the pleasure of the parents,) " This child, whose name is, N. M. *I baptize in the name of Jesus Christ*; adding, if he thinks proper, *in order to his being instructed in the principles of that religion, which was the gift of God, by Jesus Christ, and which was confirmed by the Holy Spirit.*"—Dr Priestley's *Forms of Prayer*, &c. pp. 44. 134-5.

tion of the Lord's Supper, respecting which, the same remark holds good as above, (p. 140) the elements are delivered with these words,—"Take and eat this in remembrance of Christ;"—"Take and drink this in remembrance of Christ."

It may be further remarked, in regard to this *Book of Common Prayer Reformed*, that the words—"*For his sake*," towards the end of the General Confession, are left out;—that the *Absolution*, the *Te Deum*, the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds*, together with three articles of the *Apostles' Creed*;[1] the *Epistles and Gospels*, the *Catechism*, &c. &c. are also left out:—that the phrase, "all the ministers of the gospel," is adopted instead of "all bishops, priests, and deacons," in the supplication for the clergy in the Litany; and that the Litany itself is made to conclude with the petition, that it would please God "to give us true repentance," &c. here changed into —that it may please him "to accept our sincere repentance;"—an amendment, which all sincere penitents, who had no occasion to petition God *to give them* true repentance, will, no doubt, approve and adopt.[2]

[1] The same that are rejected in Mr Carpenter's *Arian* Creed, viz. Our Saviour's descent *into hell*,—*the holy Catholic Church*, —*and the Communion of Saints*. These three articles of the Creed, it is here said, being of a low date; "and also obscure, and of undeterminate meaning, ought to have no place in a solemn declaration of our faith before Almighty God."

[2] Christmas-day,—Good-Friday,—Easter-day,—Ascension-day,—and Whitsunday, are here recognized, and collects appointed for them.

Lest those converts to Unitarianism, who had been used to the mode of worship among the dissenters, should not be able to reconcile themselves to the use of a Liturgy, such as this of Mr Lindsey; Dr Priestley, who seems to have thought a form of some kind or other indispensably necessary in our addresses to God, drew up a *set of forms for all the parts of public worship*, and also for all the other occasions of a Christian society, such as are commonly used by dissenters in England.

In this work, entitled, *Forms of Prayer, and other offices, for the use of Unitarian Christians, Birmingham*, 1783, besides forms for the morning and evening service of the Lord's day, Dr Priestley has given offices for infant and adult baptism,—a form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper,—addresses to the communicants for a second and third service,—a funeral service,—prayers for a fast day,—a prayer respecting the present state of Christians, to be used on the morning of Easter Sunday, &c. And to these is prefixed an introduction, wherein he warmly recommends the formation of Unitarian societies, in which all the parts of public worship are to be conducted by mere laymen, without the assistance of ministers of any description.

The doctor conceived, that ministers, *regularly ordained*, are by no means indispensably necessary to the constitution of a religious society, or the right administration of the Christian ordinances of *Baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*, " in

which there is nothing peculiarly sacred." "Our Saviour," says he, "gives no hint of any difference between *clergy* and *laity* among his disciples."—"Every man who understands the Christian religion, I consider as having the same commission to teach it, that I myself have; and I think my own commission as good as that of any bishop in England, or in Rome."[1]

The doctor seems to view it as a matter of little consequence, not only whether the rite of baptism be considered as obligatory on the descendants of professing Christians, or not; but also

[1] Dr Priestley's *Forms of Prayer*, &c. p. 8. and 13.—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. II. p. 513, and 768.

But to this reasoning, which implies that every bishop takes too much upon him, seeing the doctor, yea, and all his congregation, were as much bishops as he, (Numbers 16. v. 3. &c.) Bishop Horseley objects as inconclusive and unscriptural,—

"I lean to the opinion," says the learned prelate, "that the commission of a ministry, perpetuated by regular succession, is something more than a dream of cloystered gownmen, or a tale imposed upon the vulgar, to serve the ends of avarice and ambition.—For whatever confusion human folly may admit, a divine institution must have within itself a provision for harmony and order.—I could wish that the importance of the ministerial office were considered;—that the practice of antiquity were regarded; and that it might not seem a matter of perfect indifference to the Laity, to what house of worship they resort. I cannot admit, that every assembly of grave and virtuous men, in which grave and virtuous men take upon them to officiate, is to be dignified with the appellation of a church; and for such irregular assemblies, which are not churches, I could wish to find a name of distinction void of opprobrium."—*Letters to Dr Priestley*, p. 171-2.

whether both baptism and the Lord's Supper were to be discontinued after the apostolic age, or meant to be standing ordinances in the church. "Yet," says he, "I much approve of both those ordinances, and think them very valuable, for the reasons which may be found in my *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, and, I have accordingly drawn up forms for the administration of them."

His idea of baptism, if meant as a standing ordinance, is somewhat singular;—thus, "In the form for baptism," says he, "it will be perceived, that I consider it not as any thing done *in the name of the child*, that can lay him under any obligation, or properly entitle him to any privileges afterwards; but simply as what belongs to the profession of Christianity in the parent; as Abraham's circumcizing his slaves, was a thing simply incumbent upon *himself*, and in which they were not at all interested."—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper he considers, "as the most proper and public declaration of our being Christians, and as an opportunity of impressing our minds with a sense of the great objects and value of Christianity;" and these ideas he keeps in view in the forms that he has drawn up for its administration.[1]

[1] The doctor elsewhere defines this sacrament to be, "A solemn but chearful rite, in remembrance of Christ, and of what he has done and suffered for the benefit of mankind."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. ii. p. 490, &c. where, see the *advan-*

"It may be sufficient," says he, "to administer the Lord's Supper once in every month, or two months;" and he expresses his earnest wish, "that the celebration of the Lord's Supper may begin at an earlier period of life than has been usual in this country. With foreign Protestants it commences in early youth; and I see no reason why children may not be brought to this, as soon as to any *other* part of Christian worship."[1]

If the doctor's views of this Sacrament, and of the great event which it is meant to commemorate, be just, there might not perhaps be any very good reason why they should not; but his doctrine of *Materialism* seems to extend to the Sacraments also; for while their *matter*, and in part their *form*, remain in his system, what, in the opinion of many others, constitutes their *spirit* and *virtue*, seems, in a great measure, to have disappeared: and, as to their being *means of grace*, that is out of the question; the necessity of divine grace, making no article of the Unitarian Creed.[2]

tages enumerated, which the doctor ascribes to the celebration of this rite.

[1] Dr Priestley's *Forms of Prayer*, p. 42. 3. 6. 8. 9.—See also his *Address to the Protestant Dissenters, on the subject of giving the Lord's Supper to Children. London*, 1773.

[2] Thus, in Dr Priestley's Introductory Prayer for Sunday morning, he addresses the Almighty in these words:—"That our waiting upon thee in acts of public worship, may answer, &c. we would now exert all the force of our faculties to call off our attention from every foreign and improper object," &c. p. 54.

Besides these forms of prayers, and Mr Lindsey's work noticed above, both of which are sold by *Johnson*, No. 72, St. Paul's Church-yard, London, Dr Priestley mentions another work of the same nature, that is used in the *Octagon Chapel at Liverpool.* This last I have not yet seen. Perhaps it is that, entitled, *The Book of Common Prayer Reformed; for the use of the Unitarian Congregations;* which, though founded, like Mr Lindsey's Liturgy, on that of the Church of England, is said to be somewhat different from his, and to have most of the church services shortened, and the whole accommodated to the principles of Unitarians. There are also "several collections of psalms and hymns sufficiently correct for the purpose of Unitarian worship, as those for the use of the Octagon chapel at Liverpool, Mr Lindsey's, and that which Mr Christie has compiled for the use of his society at Montrose."[1]

And in the prayer before sermon, instead of asking the Divine assistance to *enable* the speaker and hearers to amend their lives, he again tells God, that—"In whatever respects we are now convinced, we have in our past lives done amiss; we will resolve for the future to do so no more, but make it our sincere and our constant endeavour to walk," &c. p. 62.

It is obvious to remark here, that but little reformation seems to be needed to accommodate these forms of Dr Priestley to the use of Deists; and from the MS. alterations that I find in the copy now before me, I am inclined to believe, that it has actually been used by some person, or persons, of Deistical principles.

[1] Dr Priestley's *Forms of Prayer*, &c. p. 35.

Mr Lindsey's collection, which is generally bound up with

Church Government and Discipline.—Dr Mosheim observes, "that the most eminent writers and patrons of the Socinians, give no clear or consistent account of the sentiments of that sect, in relation to ecclesiastical discipline and government, and the form of public worship." "All that we know is," adds he, "that they follow in these matters, generally speaking, the customs received in the Protestant churches."[1]

Transylvania is the only country in which they are not only tolerated, but have their rights and privileges secured by express laws, and possess a sort of establishment. Their church government, in that country, consists of *one superintendent* and *two consistories*. The higher consistory is composed partly of laymen, partly of the inspectors or *superintendents special* of the eight dioceses, into which the 164 Unitarian churches in that country are divided.

It appoints persons for all the livings, and receives reports from the inferior consistory, to

his Liturgy, contains many hymns that are excellent, both for matter and language, and such, that few Trinitarians will object to join in singing them.

And here the question naturally occurs, if the Unitarians in England, in their circumstances, may, and *do* sing the praises of God in their public worship, and without offence; may not the Roman Catholics in Scotland do the same? Whence comes it, that the former should have more confidence in their neighbours than the latter? Is it because a Scotch mob hath burnt a Roman Catholic *chapel*, while an English mob hath only burnt an Unitarian's *house*? See above, P. 48. Note I.

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. iv. p. 521-2.

which the church discipline is intrusted. The *superintendent general* presides in the inferior consistory, but occupies only the second place in the higher. Matrimonial affairs, &c. are under the jurisdiction of these courts.

John Biddle, the father of the English Unitarians, who maintained the Unitarian system, both in public and private, during the reign of Charles I., and the interregnum, was an Independent; and erected an independent congregation in London, which was perhaps the only one heard of in Britain, in which the peculiar doctrines of Unitarianism were inculcated, until Mr Lindsey opened his chapel, about 1774, in Essex-street, Strand.

In church government, we are told, that Dr Priestley, also, "was an Independent, believing that any number of pious Christians meeting together for the purposes of public worship, formed a church, *Cœtus credentium*; of which the internal regulation belonged to the persons composing it."[1]

[1] Summary of Dr Priestley's *Religious Opinions*, in his *Memoirs*, Vol. i. p. 479.

And yet, "it is a well known fact," says Mr Carson, "that the great bulk of Socinian churches are composed of the descendants of Presbyterians, and are maintained by the funds destined for the support of Presbyterian congregations. This is so notorious," adds he, "that the late Dr Priestley refused to allow application to be made for him to an Independent fund; while he chearfully received from a Presbyterian fund."—*Reply to Mr Brown's Vindication of the Presbyterian form of Church Government*, p. 14. Note.

Whence, I conclude, it is very likely that the Unitarians, both in England and America, are, in general, Independents.

With regard to religious establishments, it seems to be a principle of the Unitarian system, but by no means peculiar to it, that they are, in every form, and under every modification, unjust and unscriptural:—that the civil magistrate assumes an authority quite foreign to his character and office, when he interposes in any manner, or under any pretext, in matters purely religious; and that it is his incumbent duty to protect, without distinction or partiality, all classes and descriptions of men, in the enjoyment of their religious, as well as civil rights and privileges.

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, AND SEMINARIES.—According to Unitarians themselves, their number was never so great as it is at this day, and their cause is still progressive. They are said to be numerous in Germany, but I am not acquainted with any instance of their having as yet formed a distinct society in that country. In Transylvania, they were, at one time, the most numerous party of Christians, but their number there has decreased of late years, and does not now exceed 32,000. They are principally Hungarians, and live divided in 194 places or villages, and have about 164 houses of public worship. In *Clausenburg*, perhaps the same as *Coloswar*, they have a new, large, and handsome church, built in 1796, with a steeple and bells. They have, also, at the same place, a printing-of-

fice, and a college which is among the most respectable institutions of Transylvania, and consists of about 300 scholars, who usually remove from this Unitarian college, to the University of Clausenburg, to finish their studies. They have likewise a small college at *Thorda*, and a considerable number of inferior schools, in the different villages which they inhabit.

The Unitarians also occupy the village of *Andreaswalde* in Prussia, where they have free exercise of religion, and a proper house of public worship; but are obliged to pay all the parochial fees to a neighbouring Lutheran parish.

They may be found in most other parts of Europe, but perhaps no where in greater numbers than in England, notwithstanding their having as yet no legal toleration.—"Now that men have not been afraid," says Mr Lindsey, "to publish what appears to them to be the truth on this subject," of the Trinity, "notwithstanding unreasonable and unrighteous laws to the contrary, and are more and more encouraged to it, by a general tacit condemnation of such laws; this polytheistical doctrine is falling into discredit; and the doctrine of the divine unity is making its way in all countries, especially in our own."[1]

The Critical Reviewers, speaking of the Unitarians, call them "a large, a highly respectable, erudite, and virtuous body of Christians."—Their

[1] *Conversations on Christian Idolatry in the year* 1791, p. 124.

body has doubtless become large by the numbers that have joined their ranks, both from the Church and the Protestant dissenters, particularly the Presbyterians; and no small accession has been made to its respectability, erudition, and virtue, by several clergymen of the establishment, who, having embraced the Unitarian doctrine, have either, from a principle of honour and conscience, voluntarily resigned, or else been forced to quit, their situations in the church.[1]

[1] *Viz.* Drs Jebb and Disney, Mr Lindsey, and now Mr Stone.

The same honourable principle which induced Mr Lindsey to resign his church preferment, when he no longer approved of the creed of the church, remained with him through life, and would not allow him, it seems, to yield to the entreaties of his friends to remain in his situation of joint pastor of the chapel in Essex Street, after the infirmities of age prevented his bearing his part of official duty. With whatever readiness his colleague Dr Disney would have done all the duty that he could not discharge, and however acceptable Mr Lindsey's compliance would have been to the congregation, yet "I could not," says he, "have felt easy under it myself, from a principle, which I have always considered as just, *not to take the wages of another man's labour.*"—Discourse on resigning the Pastoral Office, p. 5.

Thus, in two striking instances, has Mr Lindsey's conduct held out to the clergy an example not unworthy of their imitation. *Valeat quantum valere potest.* But how little disposed those of the same sentiments with himself, who have come after him, seem to be to follow it in the one instance, recent experience has shewn; and how far many of the clergy are apt to feel easy under their disregard of it in the other, I leave those concerned to judge for themselves.

And yet, "besides those thousands who are not ashamed to avow the Unitarian doctrine, there is reason to believe that there are thousands more, both in the church and out of it, who think with us, but who are deterred by secular considerations, and the harsh spirit of the times, from avowing their real principles,—'Loving the praise of men, more than the praise of God."[1]

And after all, this seems to be, in their idea, but a "day of small things;" for forgetting those things which are present, and looking forward to those which are before them, the Unitarians raise their expectations high; *so* high indeed, that, though others may think them extravagant, "I can assure them," says Mr Belsham, "that we do not despair of the advent of a glorious period, in the revolution of ages, when the Unitarian Church shall comprehend in its ample enclosure, the whole christianized world."[2]

With a view to accelerate this happy period, and those halcyon days when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of "Christianity, simple and unadulterated," as the waters cover the sea;[3] besides their college at *Hackney*, wherein their

[1] St. John, xii. 43.
Mr Belsham's *Review* of Mr W.'s *Practical View*, p. 227.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 266.

[3] "Its deep and concealed root hath begun to put forth vigorous branches, which are extending themselves in all directions, and unquestionably will in time *cover the whole earth.*"—Mr LINDSEY'S *Discourse on resigning the Pastoral Office*, p. 22.

youths are trained up in the Unitarian doctrine, and fitted for future service in a world still lying in wickedness and *idolatry*, the Unitarians have a society in London for the distribution of books and tracts, entitled, *The Unitarian Society of Great Britain, for promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Practice of Virtue.*"[1]

They have also engaged in their favour the good wishes, if not the active exertions, of at least two able literary journals, the *Monthly* and *Critical Reviews*.

STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY.—Those who disputed the supreme Godhead of Christ, were, for a time, as already observed, chiefly of the Arian persuasion; but, of late years, the controversy respecting the divinity of Christ has chiefly been between the defenders and opposers of the Unitarian system; and, among the former of those, Dr Priestley stands particularly distinguished.

"Previously, however, to the Doctor's writings upon the subject, several works were published of the same tendency. Among these the most elaborate were,—Mr Hopkin Haynes's *Scripture*

[1] Unless by this title be meant merely, that the object of the society extends to Scotland, we are no doubt led by it to suppose, that it receives part of its support from this part of the united kingdom; but though it has long been suspected that we are not without those who lean towards Unitarianism, I am not aware that there are in Scotland, at this day, any Unitarian Societies, or even any *avowed* Unitarians.

Account of the Attributes and Worship of God, and of the Character and Offices of Jesus Christ. —Dr Lardner's *Letter written in the Year* 1730, *concerning the Question, Whether the Logos supplied the Place of a Human Soul in the Person of Jesus Christ;*—and Mr Cardale's *True Doctrine of the New Testament concerning Jesus Christ considered; wherein the misrepresentations that have been made of it, upon the Arian Hypothesis, and upon all Trinitarian and Athanasian Principles, are exposed; and the Honour of our Saviour's divine Character and Mission is maintained.*—Mr Cardale was likewise the author of—*A Comment on some remarkable Passages in Christ's Prayer at the Close of his public Ministry; being a Supplement to the true Doctrine of the New Testament;* and of *A Treatise on the Application of certain Terms and Epithets to Jesus Christ, shewing that they have no Foundation either in the written Revelation, or in any Principles of sound Reason and true Philosophy.* We may add in this place, though not published till the year 1784, Dr Lardner's *Two Schemes of a Trinity considered, and the divine Unity asserted;* in four Discourses upon Philip. ii. 5—11 The pieces referred to of Dr Lardner, besides the separate impressions of them, may be seen in his works, Vol. xi. p. 79—196.; Vol. x. p. 600—645.

" Dr Priestley's publications, relative to the present subject, are,—*An Appeal to the serious and Candid Professors of Christianity;* No. 5.—*A familiar Illustration of certain Passages of Scrip-*

ture.—A general View of the Arguments for the Unity of God, and against the Divinity and Pre-existence of Christ, from Reason, from the Scriptures, and from History.—An History of the Corruptions of Christianity.—A Reply to the Animadversions on the History of the Corruptions of Christianity, in the Monthly Review for June 1783.—*Letters to Dr Horsley, Archdeacon of St Alban's,* in three parts.—*Remarks on the Monthly Review of the Letters to Dr Horsley.—An History of early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ.—Defences of Unitarianism for the Year* 1786.—*Defences of Unitarianism for the Year* 1787.—And *Defences of Unitarianism for the Years* 1788 *and* 1789.

One of the most distinguished opponents of Dr Priestley was Dr Horsley, successively bishop of St David's and of Rochester, in three distinct publications, now collected together into one volume, under the following title: *Tracts in Controversy with Dr Priestley, upon the historical Question of the Belief of the first Ages in our Lord's Divinity. Originally published in the Years* 1783, 1784, *and* 1786. *Now revised, and augmented with a large Addition of Notes and Supplemental Disquisitions.*

Among the other antagonists of Dr Priestley, may be mentioned Dr Horne, in his sermon on *the Duty of Contending for the Faith,* and his *Letter by an Under-Graduate of Oxford.*—Mr Parkhurst, in his *Demonstration, from Scripture, of the Divinity and Pre-existence of our Saviour.*

—E. W. Whitaker, in his four *Dialogues on the Doctrine of the Trinity.*—Dr Geddes, in his *Letter to prove, by one prescriptive Argument, that the Divinity of Jesus Christ was a primitive Tenet of Christianity.*[1]—Mr Howes, in his Appendix to his fourth volume of *Observations on Books.*—Dr Croft, in his *Bampton Lectures.*—Mr Hawkins, in his *Expostulatory Address to Dr Priestley.*—Dr Knowles, in his *Primitive Christianity.*—Mr Barnard, in his *Divinity of Christ demonstrated.*—Mr Kett, in his *Bampton Lectures*; and some volumes besides of the same lectures.

"Another advocate for the Socinian scheme is Mr Lindsey, in his *Apology for Resigning the Vicarage of Catterick*; his *Sequel to the Apology*; his *Two Dissertations on the Preface to St John's Gospel, and on praying to Christ*; his *Catechist*,

[1] Dr Geddes's prescriptive argument, contained in this letter, which was published in 1787, is "*the formal decision of the Nicene council;*" and he asks Dr Priestley, "whether he thinks it in the smallest degree probable, that 318 of the principal pastors in the Christian church, convoked from the three parts of the then known world, could possibly combine to establish a doctrine different from that which they had hitherto taught their respective flocks, and which they had themselves received from their predecessors in the ministry?"

From the answer to this question, if given in the negative, which doubtless it must be by every impartial and unprejudiced person, another question arises, viz. Is it in the smallest degree probable, that their predecessors could have come by a doctrine, which they unanimously maintained, in any other way than by its being conveyed down to them in succession from the apostles themselves?

or an Inquiry concerning the only true God and Object of Worship; his *Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship;* in his *Vindiciæ Priestleianæ, being an Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge;* his *Second Address to the same;* his *Examination of Mr Robinson's Plea for the Divinity of Christ;* his *List of false Readings and Mistranslations of the Scriptures which contribute to support the great Error concerning Jesus Christ;* his *Conversations on Christian Idolatry;* and his *Inquiry into the Evidence which points out Christ to have been only a Creature of the Human Race invested with extraordinary Powers from God, as it arises from his own Declarations, and those of his Apostles and Evangelists.* This last piece is in the first volume of the *Commentaries and Essays published by the Society for promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures.*

"The productions in support of the divinity of our Lord, occasioned by Mr Lindsey's writings, are principally as follows: *A Plea for the Divinity of Christ,* by Mr Robinson.—*A scriptural Confutation of the Arguments against the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,* by a Layman.—*A Vindication of the Doctrine and Liturgy of the Church of England,* by George Bingham, B. D.—*Reflections on the Apology of the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey.*—*A Vindication of the Worship of the Son and the Holy Ghost, against the Exceptions of Mr Theophilus Lindsey, from Scripture and Antiquity,* by Thomas Randolph,

D. D.—*A Letter to the Remarker on the Layman's Scriptural Confutation*, by Dr Randolph. —And *An Inquiry into the Belief of the Christians of the first three Centuries, respecting the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, by William Burgh, Esq. the author of the Layman's *Scriptural Confutation*.

"A tract under the title of *Objections to Mr Lindsey's Interpretation of the first fourteen Verses of St John's Gospel, as set forth in the Sequel to his Apology*, by a serious Enquirer, is an Arian publication. Two pieces were published in defence of Mr Lindsey; these were, *Remarks on the Layman's Scriptural Confutation*, and *Letters to Dr Randolph*, both of them written by the Rev. Mr Temple. Concerning the worship of our Saviour, besides the treatises already specified, appeared, *Remarks on Mr Lindsey's Dissertation upon Praying to Christ; in which the Arguments he there proposes against the Lawfulness of all religious Addresses to the Lord Jesus, are examined.* Upon this subject, without any reference to Mr Lindsey's writings, we may here add Dr Horne's sermon on *Christ's being the Object of religious Adoration*, and a pamphlet, entitled, *Divine Worship due to the whole blessed Trinity.* On the other side of the question is a posthumous tract of Mr Cardale's, being an *Enquiry, whether we have any Scripture Warrant for a direct Address of Supplication, Praise, or Thanksgiving, either to the Son or to the Holy Ghost.*"

Additional works in vindication of our Lord's Divinity are Dr Shepherd's *Free Examination of the Socinian Exposition of the prefatory Verses of St John's Gospel.—A Defence of the Doctrine, and eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, in Opposition to a late Scheme of temporal Sonship.*—Hodson's *Jesus Christ the true God, and only Object of supreme Adoration.*—The same gentleman's *Answer to Mr Frend's Address.*—Holder's *Doctrine of the divine Trinity in Unity.*—Fletcher's *Socinianism unscriptural.*—Whitaker's *Origin of Arianism disclosed.*—Mr Randolph's *Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments.*—And Dr Hawker's *Sermons on the Divinity of Christ.*

Additional productions of an opposite kind, are, *An Elucidation of the Unity of God, deduced from Scripture and Reason.*—Christie's *Discourses on the Unity.*—Wakefield's *Enquiry into the Opinions of the Christian Writers of the three first Centuries concerning the person of Christ.—A Friendly Dialogue between a common Unitarian Christian and an Athanasian,* being a republication, with very considerable alterations, of a tract formerly printed by Mr Hopkins.—Frend's *Address to the Members of the Church of England.*—Lofft's *Observations on the first Part of Dr Knowles's Testimonies.*—Clarke's *Defence of the Unity of God.*—Ashdowne's *Unitarian, Arian, and Trinitarian Opinions respecting Christ examined and tried by Scripture Evidence alone.*—Mr Edwards's *Address and Vindication.*—Mr Smith's

Letter to a Member of the Church of England.—*Reasons for Unitarianism.*—Dr Disney's *Letters to Dr Knox.*—Jardine's *three Discourses.*—Mr Potter's *Answer to Dr Hawker.*—And Mr Hobhouse's *Reply to Mr Randolph.*

"The miraculous conception of our Lord has been called in question in the fourth volume of the *Theological Repository*, p. 245—305; and still more fully in Dr Priestley's *History of early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ.* In vindication of the miraculous conception, two tracts have been written by Mr Nisbett; the first with a particular view to Dr Priestley's exceptions on the subject: and the second in answer to a private letter, addressed to him by Mr John Pope. Mr Pope has published a reply to Mr Nisbett."[1]

Since the above was written by Dr Kippis, the Unitarian cause has been ably supported by Mr Belsham, in his *Review of Mr Wilberforce's Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System*, &c. and in his *Letters upon Arianism*, &c. already mentioned.[2]

And if Dr Priestley found a doughty champion

[1] Dr Kippis's Note to Dr Doddridge's *Lect.* vol. ii. p. 172, &c.

[2] Mr T. Belsham, Divinity Professor at the New College, Hackney, and minister of the Unitarian Chapel, Essex Street, Strand, is now at the head of this denomination in England; and I sincerely regret, on the reader's account, on my own account, and particularly on Mr Belsham's account, that the imperfection of his sight would not permit him to review my MS. on the subject of this article. It is however considerably improved by *his references* and obliging assistance.

of the orthodox doctrine in Bishop Horsley, and an able answer to his *Corruptions of Christianity*, in what he had written against it; he also lived to see a powerful antidote to what he had further advanced against the Trinity, in his *History of Early Opinions*, &c. in Dr Jamieson's masterly work, entitled, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of Scripture and of the Primitive Faith, concerning the Deity of Christ*,[1] &c.; 2 vols. 8vo.

The Unitarians have likewise found an acute opponent in Mr Fuller, a particular Baptist minister of Kettering, Northamptonshire, whose ablest work on the subject of this controversy is entitled, *The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems examined and compared as to their moral Tendency*. On the other hand, Dr Toulmin has written—*Letters on the Practical Efficacy of the Unitarian doctrine*.[2]

[1] This latter work of Dr Priestley was meant as an amplification and vindication of that part of the former which respected our Saviour; and Dr Jamieson's reply to it, which seems not to be so well known as it deserves, was printed, in 1794, for C. Dilly, Poultry, and J. Ogle, Edinburgh. The learned and respectable author, late of Forfar, and now of this place, has also published several tracts on the same controversy.

[2] We are told, that, in Dr Priestley's *Preliminary Discourse* to his *Free Address to Protestant Dissenters*, "the love of Christ is considered as exciting a stronger sympathy, and having a more powerful practical effect, when he is contemplated as a man, who lived and died to promote and secure the final happiness of mankind, apart from those false ideas annexed to his character in the Athanasian and Arian schemes."—*Memoirs of Dr Priestley*, Vol. II. p. 535.

And here I would observe, that, independently of all the arguments against Unitarianism that have been advanced by Christians, there is one furnished by a *Jew*, that appears to me to be of very considerable weight, though it has not yet, as far as I know, been even claimed, and much less duly stated, or placed in a proper point of view. It arises from the free and open avowal made by Mr Levi, in his correspondence with Dr Priestley, that—"the divinity of Christ,—his pre-existence, and power to abrogate the ceremonial part of the law;[1]—as also the miraculous conception, *are all taught in the Gospels*;—and the ceremony just mentioned," *i. e.* baptism "points out the essential qualification of a Christian; consequently, *he that does not believe the doctrine of the Trinity, cannot be a Christian, if the Gospels be true.*"[2]

This will no doubt appear to many readers as somewhat paradoxical. But we often stumble upon such passages in the writings of this, and some other denominations.

[1] That our Saviour possessed this power is denied by Dr Priestley.

[2] *Letters to Dr Priestley in* 1789, p. 24.

Dr Priestley believes that "nothing more is requisite to denominate any person a Christian, but his believing the divine mission of Christ."

Mr Levi justly requires more than this to entitle one to the name, and will not allow that the Doctor himself has a right to it; nay, says he, "you yourself, and those that are of your opinions, are not considered as Christians by those that account themselves orthodox; as I understand, from both clergy and laity with whom I have conversed."—*Answer to Dr Priestley*, p. 77.

Here then the Trinitarians have acquired, not one friend and advocate only, but a host of from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000, many of whom are eminent for talents and learning; for I understand, upon due enquiry, that Mr Levi's sentiments are strictly Judaical.—Thus, instead of gaining over the Jews to his party, which seems to have been Dr Priestley's grand object in repeatedly addressing them, he has thereby completely lost them; and drawn from them this public declaration, which can amount to nothing less than that, were they to become Christians, the Trinitarian side of the present question is that to which they would attach themelves, and to which they would adhere, as they would not forfeit the Christian *name*.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.—Considering the subject of this article to be most interesting to Christians of every description and denomination, and indeed as the most important ground of controversy now, or at any time, agitated in the Christian world; I have already extended it far

Mr Levi might have gone yet farther, and remarked, that even *F. Socinus* would not allow those to be Christians, who did not think it right to pray to Jesus Christ as he did.

Whatever be the reader's opinion on the subject of this article, and whatever name he may be disposed to give the religionists in question, he will no doubt heartily join me in praying with our Church, that "all who profess *and call themselves* Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

beyond its due limits, and must still add some further observations.

Whatever opinion should be formed of Unitarian principles, and by whatever name their professors should be called, I can see no very good reason for calling their sincerity in question, with Mr S. Jenyns and others; nor can I doubt, that they firmly believe theirs to be the cause of God and of true religion. Some of them have doubtless given strong proofs of their sincerity, and others assure us, that they will not be backward to exhibit equal proofs of it, were it to be put to the test. That it has not been more severely tried, may be ascribed to the mildness of the government under which they live; and it might be well that their sense of the privileges, which they even now enjoy, were to become more apparent, by their refraining from all appearance of disrespect towards the religion of their country,—by their not holding up its doctrines to public odium, as unscriptural, idolatrous, palpably absurd, and the like; and, by their no longer telling the world, that "*Christianity, in this country, is not only not established, but not tolerated by legal authority.*"[1]

I have been often and forcibly struck with such expressions, in the perusal of their voluminous and multifarious writings; and being not more a

[1] See *A Short View of the Controversies occasioned by the Confessional, &c.* by A. D. 1775; or Brewster's *Secular Essay*, p. 262, &c.

friend to *ex*pulsive than to *com*pulsive measures, had I any right to advise in this case, I would drop a *verbum sapientibus*, and recommend their not losing sight of the nature of the misdemeanor which occasioned the expulsion of their society from Poland *for ever*.[1]

In other respects, I have remarked much genuine candour, and various amiable traits of character in each of the three modern pillars of Unitarianism—Dr Priestley, Mr Lindsey, and Mr T. Belsham; between whom a good understanding and mutual affection seem to have subsisted all along, notwithstanding some difference of opinion in lesser matters. This happy "*concordia discors*" must no doubt have tended to further the common cause in which they were engaged; and yet, to observe it cannot be unpleasing even to those who widely differ from them in religious matters; and it should command not their attention only, but also their imitation.

To say nothing of Dr Priestley's being a strenuous, and at the same time an able, advocate for the truth of Christianity against infidels,[2] I cannot close this article without noticing his warmly recommending, and always maintaining in his own household, the very important and becoming, but in our days much neglected, duty of family prayer. The pleasure also which he took in the religious instruction of youth, and the im-

[1] See above, p. 150.

[2] Mr Belsham also has lately published a respectable work on the evidences of Christianity.

portance and weight which he seemed to attach to that duty in the several congregations with which he was connected as pastor, cannot be too highly applauded; nor can this his example be too generally followed. What a pity is it, that instances of such attention to two most important duties should be so unfrequent in the world, and particularly among those whose talents and distinction, as in this case, would give weight and currency to their example!

"Difference in opinion shall *never*, I hope, cause me to detract from any man's just commendations, or lessen my esteem of him in any thing wherein he deserves it."[1]

At the same time, I am ready to admit with Mr Belsham, "that a religious party may be very numerous, very pious and benevolent, very zealous and successful, and yet its distinguishing tenets may be erroneous and unscriptural." How far the tenets of the party now considered may be *erroneous and unscriptural* it is not the author's province to say; his duty in regard to it is discharged for the present, and he now leaves the reader to judge for himself, and to determine between it and the Established Church, upon whose tenets these and such like epithets are so unmercifully hurled.

"I believe in God, and Mohammed his prophet," says the disciple of the celebrated oriental

[1] Dr Brett's *Remarks on Dr Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 176.

impostor. "I believe in God, and Jesus Christ, a prophet and teacher," is the creed of the Unitarian. But the member of the church established will not reduce his faith to a level with that of Mohammed; nor will he look for salvation in the *Manual of Epictetus*, or in the *Offices of Cicero*. No,—he "finds a fuller *faith* in scripture, which is *the anchor of his soul, both sure and certain;* a faith, which has God for its object, in the most perfect state of *unity*, but in whose essence are *Jesus Christ*, the Son of his love, without whose meritorious death and sufferings sinners never could have been reconciled to the Almighty, and All-just; and the *Holy Spirit*, without whose inspiration the best of men could neither think a good thought, nor perform a good action. The language of scripture is rendered consistent by thus considering the great Object of religious adoration. The true state of man's condition is laid open, his utter incapability of redeeming himself from the penalty of sin is rendered clear and perspicuous; his sole dependence on a Saviour is made manifest, in whose person are united both the human and divine natures, that he might at once, though sinless himself, represent that nature which had sinned, and at the same time afford an adequate propitiatory sacrifice; and his gratitude is inflamed by a revelation of that holy divine Comforter, who descends into his heart with gifts and graces, the precious fruits of faith, and the blessed assurance of immortal happiness.

"What have heathen morals, what have the *cor-*

rupted doctrines of Christianity to offer equal to these great and invaluable blessings? Man, who knows his own weakness, relies not on his own merits, but on the merits of his Saviour; man, whose carnal heart sinks under worldly oppressions, and worldly temptations, rises superior to them all, in the confidence of spiritual assistance. 'If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye, *through the Spirit*, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For *as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.* For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.'[1]—*Rom.* viii. 13, 14, 15."

[1] Brewster's *Secular Essay*, p. 267, &c.

MATERIALISM,

AND

MATERIALISTS.[1]

NAME.—The Manicheans, and several Oriental sects, had an abhorrence of *matter*, and therefore all parts of scripture that mentioned the uses of matter were rejected by them as *spurious*, and

[1] See above, p. 166, note; and p. 167.

I confess, I am disposed to believe with Dr Priestley, that the doctrines of *Unitarianism*, *Materialism*, and *Philosophical* or *Mechanical Necessity*, if they be not equally parts of one system, are at least more nearly connected than Mr Belsham seems willing to allow. Thus,—the scheme of *necessity* is the immediate result of the *materiality* of man, *mechanism* being the undoubted consequence of *materialism*; and this last is eminently subservient to the Unitarian docrine of the *proper* or *mere humanity* of Christ. For, if no man have a soul distinct from his body, Christ, who in all other respects appeared as a man, could not have a soul which had existed *before* his body; and thus the whole doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, of which the opinion of the pre-existence of Christ is a branch, will be effectually overturned.

at length the whole Old Testament was cut off at one stroke. On the contrary, many of our *modern* philosophers are prodigious *friends* of *matter*; and therefore, to suit their principles, the scripture must be so construed, as that even the *soul* may be material. The abettors of this doctrine are called *Materialists*.

DOCTRINE, &c.—The Materialists believe and attempt to prove, contrary to the opinion which has been almost universally prevalent in the Christian church in all ages, that man does not consist of two substances essentially different from each other; but is of an uniform composition, and that the conscious principle, or what we generally term the soul, is merely a property resulting from such an organical structure as that of the brain.

From this hypothesis it seems to follow, as an immediate and necessary consequence,—that man is not a free agent;—that the soul is not naturally immortal; and,—that there is no intermediate state of consciousness between death and the resurrection, for the properties of sensation and thought must of course be extinguished at the dissolution of that system of organized matter, to which they appertain.[1]

[1] In searching the scriptures for passages expressive of the state of man at death, the *Materialists* cite Job xiv. 7—12. Psalm vi. 5, &c. as texts wherein they find such declarations as, they conceive, expressly exclude any trace of *sense*, *thought*, or *enjoyment*.

This doctrine of Materialism has long been considered as a tenet peculiar to infidelity; and has even been held in almost as much abhorrence by the generality of Christians as atheism itself. It, notwithstanding, was very prevalent in France before the late revolution, and has also been gaining ground in this country of late. It has been copiously discussed, and warmly patronized by Dr Priestley, in his *Disquisitions concerning Matter and Spirit*, and in the *Free Discussion of the Doctrines of Materialism, and Philosophical Necessity*, in a correspondence between him and Dr Price; and, by his friend Mr T. Cooper, in his *Philosophical Essays*, &c.

Dr Priestley states it as a primary axiom, "that the power of sensation or perception, never having been found but in conjunction with a certain organized system of matter, we ought, as philosophers, to conclude, that this power necessarily exists, and results from that organized system, *unless* it can be shown to be incompatible with other known properties of the same substance." This, if the premises be granted, will not readily be denied; at the same time, it must be admitted, that constant conjunction implies necessary connection, only when reasons cannot be discovered to prove the conjunction to be accidental and arbitrary. And the argument seems to stand on somewhat similar ground, to that held up to ridicule by Tully, whereby Epicurus attempted to prove, that "the gods had human bodies, because he had never seen a reasonable or intelli-

gent mind, but in such bodies." The absolute incompatibility of perception with the known and acknowledged properties of the material substance, has been illustrated by Dr S. Clarke, in his successive replies to the doctrine of Spinoza, Hobbes, and Collins, with such transcendent ability, that little else has been left for succeeding writers on the same side, than to repeat the same arguments in different language.

On the orthodox side, see also Berington's *Letters on Materialism*, and his *Immaterialism Delineated;* Gifford's *Outlines of an Answer to Dr Priestley's Disquisitions;* Dr Beattie's *Elements of Moral Science*, and the 1st vol. of Mr W. Belsham's *Essays*, Edit. 1799.

Modern philosophers have been perhaps too hasty in concluding, from the reciprocal influence of the soul and body on each other, that the former, as well as the latter, is material; for according to the opponents of this doctrine, there are no doubt arguments sufficient to evince them to be distinct beings, with different powers, though capable of exerting a mutual influence on each other. In supposing them to do so, there is no absurdity; and that they cannot exert such a mutual influence, allowing them to be distinct substances, is a negative, which, say they, never has been, nor ever can be proved. Every power of the mind, and every property observable in matter, are so essentially different, that the idea of homogeneity in the two substances is too extravagant to be admitted on any other ground than

a direct proof of the impossibility of the action of spirit on matter, without the existence of some common property. The orthodox opinion therefore is, that the soul is *simple*, uncompounded, and *immaterial*, or *incorporeal*, and distinct from matter. On this head, Christians in general, however widely they may differ on other points, are fully agreed; and indeed, so well satisfied in regard to it, that you will scarcely find one of a thousand, who, on being questioned, will not be ready to answer with Sterne: "I am positive I have a soul, nor can all the books with which materialists have pestered the world, ever convince me to the contrary."[1]

It is further observed, that, independently of what has been said against the doctrine of *Materialism* by others, the question seems now at length to be determined, and the modern theory of the materialists shaken from its very foundation by Dr Ferrier, who, in a valuable paper published in the 4th vol. of the *Memoirs of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester*, p. 20—44. has proved anatomically concerning the brain, by evidence apparently complete, that every part of it has been injured, without affecting the act of thought.

Mr Locke seems to suppose it possible that there may be some such unknown substratum, as may be capable of receiving the properties both

[1] *Sentimental Journey*, p. 107. Cook's Edit.

of matter and of mind, viz. extension, solidity, and cogitation; for he supposes it possible for God to add cogitation to that substance which is *corporeal*, and thus to cause *matter* to think.[1] If this be true, then spirits (for aught we know), may be *corporeal* beings; which is a doctrine very favourable to the *mortality* of the soul.

But the question about the *immateriality* of the soul is not perhaps of so great consequence as some may imagine; for, when we consider the nature and attributes of God, the faculties of man, and the constitution of the world in which he is placed, there are the best grounds for believing that he is an *accountable being*: and we may rest assured, that of *whatever materials* his sentient part is composed, Omnipotence will not want the means of placing him hereafter in an *accountable state*, so as that he shall be obliged to give an account of his conduct.[2]

Those who desire still further information on the subject of this controversy, may consult Archdeacon Blackburne's *Historical View* of it; Dr Law's Appendix to his *Theory of Natural and Revealed Religion*, and *the Light of Nature pur-*

[1] *On the Human Understanding*, book iv. chap. 3. sect. 6.

[2] The advocates for Materialism are so far from allowing that their doctrine militates against the hope of a resurrection, that they insist it is not only more philosophical, but also points out "more fully the necessity and value of a *resurrection from the dead*;" on which alone, say they, the sacred writers build all our hope of a future life, 1 Cor. xv. 16, 32, &c.

sued, by Edward Search, Esq. Much curious matter, and many ingenious illustrations of the subject, may be found in the second volume of this last work. The author's real name was not E. Search, but Ab. Tucker, who died at his seat in Surrey in 1775.

NECESSITARIANISM,

AND

NECESSITARIANS.

THE doctrine of *Necessity* regards the origin of human actions, and the specific mode of the divine government; and seems to be the immediate result of the *materiality* of man, for mechanism is the undoubted consequence of materialism.[1]

Whatever is done by a cause or power that is irresistible, is by *necessity*, in which sense this term is opposed to *freedom*. Man is therefore a *necessary* agent, if all his actions be so determined by the causes preceding each action, that not one past action could possibly not have come to pass, or have been otherwise than it hath been; and not one future action can possibly not come to pass, or

[1] Hence all Materialists are of course Necessitarians; but it does not follow, *vice versa*, that all Necessitarians are, or must be, Materialists.

be otherwise than it shall be. But man is a *free* agent, if he be able at any time, in the circumstances in which he is placed, to do different things; or in other words, if he be not unavoidably determined in every point of time by the circumstances he is in, and the causes he is under, to do that one thing he does, and not possibly to do any other thing.

This abstruse subject has occasioned much controversy, and has been debated by writers of the first eminence, from Hobbes and Clarke, to Priestley and Gregory. To state all their arguments on both sides, would take up too much room; and, indeed, such a statement cannot reasonably be expected in a work of this nature, the question being less of a theological, than of a philosophical and metaphysical nature. Suffice it, therefore, only to say, that the *Anti-necessitarians* suppose that the doctrine of Necessity charges God as the author of sin;—that it takes away the freedom of the will;—renders man unaccountable to his Maker;—makes sin to be no evil, and morality or virtue to be no good;—and, that it precludes the use of means, and is of the most gloomy tendency.

The *Necessitarians*, on the other hand, deny these to be legitimate consequences of their doctrine, which they declare to be the most consistent mode of explaining the divine government; and they observe, that the Deity acts no more immorally in decreeing vicious actions, than in permitting all those irregularities which he could so ea-

lily have prevented. All necessity, say they, doth not take away freedom. The actions of a man may be at one and the same time both free and necessary. Thus, it was infallibly certain, that Judas would betray Christ, yet he did it voluntarily; Jesus Christ necessarily became man, and died, yet he acted freely. A good man doth naturally and necessarily love his children, yet voluntarily. They insist that necessity doth not render actions less morally good; for, "if necessary virtue be neither moral nor praise worthy, it will follow, that God himself is not a moral being, because he is a necessary one; and the obedience of Christ cannot be good, because it was necessary." Farther, say they, necessity does not preclude the use of means; for means are no less appointed than the end. It was ordained that Christ should be delivered up to death; but he could not have been betrayed without a betrayer, nor crucified without crucifiers. And that it is not a gloomy doctrine they allege, because nothing can be more consolatory than to believe, that all things are under the direction of an All-wise Being; that his kingdom ruleth over all, and that he doeth all things well. It is also observed, that to deny necessity is to deny the foreknowledge of God, and to wrest the sceptre from the hand of the Creator, and to place that capricious and undefinable principle, the self determining power of man, upon the throne of the universe. Besides, say they, the scripture places the doctrine beyond all doubt, and they quote in

their favour Job xxiii. 13, 14. Job xxxiv. 29. Prov. xvi. 4. Isa. xlv. 7. St Matth. x. 29, 30. St Luke xxiv. 26. St John vi. 37. Acts xiii. 48. &c.

The principal writers on the side of Necessity are, Hobbes, Collins, Leibnitz, Hume, Hutcheson, Kaimes, Hartley, Edwards, Priestley, Crombie, Toplady, T. and W. Belsham, and perhaps Locke.[1] Of these, Hartley, Hume, and Priestley, are perhaps the most profound reasoners, and Lord Kaimes, the most perspicuous writer, on the subject.

On the other side are, Clarke, King, Law, Reid, Butler, Price, Bryant, Wollaston, Beattie, Horseley, Gregory, Butterworth, &c.

This doctrine of *Necessity* is nearly connected with that of *Predestination*, which, of late years, has assumed a form very different from that which it formerly possessed; for, instead of being considered as a point to be determined almost entirely by the sacred writings, in the hands of a number

[1] Several others have taken part with the advocates for *Necessity*, as Mr Forsyth, in his *Principles of Moral Science*, Judge Cooper, &c. "The time seems to have arrived," says the latter of these gentlemen, "when the separate existence of the human soul, *the freedom of the will*, and the eternal duration of future punishment, like the doctrines of the Trinity, and Transubstantiation, may be regarded as no longer entitled to public discussion."—*Appendix*, No. 2. to *Memoirs* of Dr Priestley, vol. i. p. 335.

Interest reipublicæ ut denique sit finis litium, is a maxim of technical law; the same will equally apply to philosophy and religion; and what shorter way than this can be devised of settling some of the most knotty and perplexing controversies?

of able writers, it has in a great measure resolved itself into a question of natural religion, under the head of the Philosophical liberty or necessity of the will: or, whether all human actions are, or are not, necessarily determined by motives arising from the character which God has impressed on our minds, and the train of circumstances amidst which his providence has placed us? The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination is, that "God, for his own glory, hath *fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass.*" The scheme of *Philosophical Necessity*, as stated by an intimate friend and warm admirer of Dr Priestley, the most celebrated Necessitarian of the age, is, "That *every thing* is *predetermined* by the Divine Being; that whatever has been, *must* have been; and that whatever will be, *must* be;—that *all events* are *pre-ordained* by infinite wisdom and unlimited goodness;—that the will, in all its determinations, is governed by the state of mind;—that the state of mind is, in every instance, determined by the Deity; and that there is a continued chain of causes and effects, of motives and actions, inseparably connected, and originating from the condition in which we are brought into existence by the Author of our being." [1]

[1] *Essay on Philos. Necessity*, by Alexander Crombie, A. M. See Dr Priestley's two *Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit, and on Philosophical Necessity;* in the former of which, the mechanism of the mind is asserted, and in the latter the doctrine of necessity. The works on both sides may be seen in Dr DODDRIDGE's *Lectures*, Vol. I. Edit. 1799.

On the other hand, Dr Doddridge very justly remarks, that "those who believe the being and perfections of God, and a state of retribution, in which he will reward and punish mankind according to the diversity of their actions, will find it difficult to reconcile the justice of punishment with the necessity of crimes punished. And they that believe all that the scripture says on the one hand, of the eternity of future punishments, and, on the other, of God's compassion to sinners, and his solemn assurance that he desires not their death, will find the difficulty greatly increased."

It is doubtless an article of the Christian faith, that God will reward or punish every man hereafter according to his actions in this life. But we cannot maintain his justice in this particular, if men's actions be necessary either in their own nature, or by the divine decrees. Activity, and self-determining powers, are the foundation of all morality; and to prove that such powers belong to man, it is urged that we ourselves are conscious of possessing them. We blame and condemn ourselves when we do amiss; but an inward sense of shame, guilt, and remorse of conscience, are feelings which are inconsistent with the scheme of necessity. It is also agreed, that some actions deserve praise, and afford an inward satisfaction; but for this, there would be no foundation, if we were invincibly determined in every volition: so that approbation and blame are consequent upon free actions only.

CALVINISM,

AND

CALVINISTS.

NAMES.—The terms *Calvinism* and *Calvinists* are derived from *John Calvin*,[1] a zealous and eminent reformer, and contemporary with *Luther*. They occur so early as 1564; and it was the controversy on the Eucharist which first rendered them characteristical appellations.

It appears from Bishop Jewel's *Defence of his Apology for the Church of England*,[2] that the title of *Calvinist* was also affixed to our Reformers, and the English Protestants in general, by the adherents of the Church of Rome, as a term of reproach. As such, it was afterwards revived by one class of Protestants against another; and,

[1] His real name was *Cauvin*, but having put *Calvini* to his Commentary on the two books of Seneca, published at Paris in 1532, he was thence called *Calvin*.

[2] Pp. 64, 152, 154, 198, &c. Edit. 1611.

at length, from long accustomed appropriation, and for distinction's sake, those who held doctrines and principles more nearly agreeing with the writings of Calvin than with those of Arminius, were called Calvinists, a name which they still retain in this country; while those on the Continent of Europe have long been more generally known by the title of the *Reformed.*[1] Wherever Calvinism has been the *established* religion, the Presbyterian form of church government has been adopted;[2] and hence the term *Presbyterians* most frequently includes *Calvinists*, but not *vice versa;* for many who have adopted those doctrines which are known as Calvinistic, have been Independents, and not a few of them warm friends of Episcopacy. "If we would look for warm advocates of church authority in general, and for able writers in defence of our own form of church government in particular, such," says Bishop Horsley, "we shall find

[1] The title of *Reformed*, which with us is generally used as standing in opposition to Popery alone, was given to those Protestant Churches which did not embrace the doctrine and discipline of Luther. It was first assumed by the *French* Protestants, and afterwards became the common denomination of all the Calvinistical Churches on the Continent, which it still continues to be. But as there does not appear to be any good reason for the denomination, as applied to those churches in particular, it should doubtless be laid aside.

[2] I am aware that this is likely to be objected to by most readers of this denomination; for Calvinists in general conceive that Calvinism, doctrinally viewed, is as much the established creed in England as in Scotland.

among those divines of our church, who were called, in their day, the *Doctrinal Calvinists.*"[1]

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—Calvin was born at *Noyon*, in Picardy, in 1509, and educated at Paris under *Corderius*, with a view to the church; but, conceiving a dislike to Popery, he entered upon the study of the civil law, in which he is said to have made considerable progress. Afterwards, finding it unsafe for him as a Protestant to remain in France, he retired to *Basil*, in Switzerland, where he again turned his thoughts to divinity, and published his *Institutions of the Christian Religion* in Latin, with a bold and elegant dedication to *Francis I*, king of France. In 1536, he became professor of divinity at *Geneva*; but being soon after obliged to leave that place, he withdrew to *Strasburg*, where he officiated in a French church of his own establishment, and was also chosen professor of divinity. In the mean time, the Genevese earnestly invited him to return; and he, accepting their invitation in

[1] *Charge* for 1801, p. 34.

" Indeed, I never yet could discover, what *necessary* connection there is between Calvinism, and that spurious form of ecclesiastical government, Presbyterianism."—FABER'S *Thoughts on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversies*, p. 42.

Even Calvin himself was, or professed to be, a warm friend and admirer of the Episcopalian form of church government. *Vide* Calv. *Confes. Fid. Gall. Epist. ad Cran. de Reformand. Eccles. necessitate. Vera Eccles. Reformatio Epist. ad regem Poloniæ.* Calv. *Inst.* L. 4. c. 4. Passim. *Epist.* 190, &c. &c.

1541, set on foot a rigorous system of ecclesiastical discipline, and continued at Geneva actively employed as a preacher and a writer, till his death, which happened in 1564.[1]

Even his enemies admit that he was a person of great talents, indefatigable industry, and considerable learning; and it is generally allowed, that he wrote both in French and Latin, with great purity.[2] But the tenets which are commonly called *Calvinistic*, ought not to be considered as originating wholly with him; for many of them appear in authors long anterior to Calvin, especially in the works of *St. Austin*, whom, and the Latin Church, it would appear, he had nearly followed. "The opinions of Austin, which are the basis of Calvinism, have had their strenuous assertors in the Church of Rome itself. Indeed, for a long time, they were the prevailing opinions of the Latin Church."[3]

[1] See Beza's *Life of Calvin*, prefixed to his works; *Bolsec* also wrote a life of him. The former wrote as a friend, the latter as an enemy; the truth may perhaps lie between them.

[2] His Theological works were published in 9 vols. folio. The Amsterdam edition, *apud Schipper*, of 1671, *et an. seqq.* is considered, I believe, as correct.

[3] Bishop Horsley, as above. See also Bishop Prettyman's *Elements*, Vol. II. p. 312; and Dean Tucker's *Letter to Dr Kippis*.

Many of those opinions, which are usually called Calvinistic, appear, we are told, in the works of Austin, Hilary, Prosper, Fulgentius, and other fathers of the primitive church, who handled the Pelagian controversy; and most, if not all of them, in those of the Waldenses, of Gotteschalcus, Huss, Jerome of

Calvin soon opposed not only the abettors of the Church of Rome, but in some measure Luther also, particularly on the subject of the Eucharist; and the disciples of the one became in a short time distinguished from those of the other. He also differed on the same and several other points of doctrine from *Zuingle*, who was a native of Switzerland, an eminent Reformer, and the founder of the Reformed Church in that country. But ever since the synod of Dort in 1618, which is the last Council that was held, the Calvinists have been chiefly opposed to the *Arminians*.

The tenets that have been usually styled Calvinistic, soon found their way into Germany,[a]

Prague, the venerable Bede, Grosseteste, Wickliffe, Bradwardine, and even in those of the Schoolmen, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus, all long anterior to Calvin.

[a] Among their chief patrons in Germany, we may reckon *Frederick* III., Elector Palatine, who, in 1560, removed from their pastoral functions the Lutheran doctors, and filled their places with Calvinists; and, at the same time, obliged his subjects to embrace the tenets, rites, and institutions of the Church of Geneva. From 1583, the influence and reputation of the Church of the Palatinate became so considerable, under the government of the Elector *John Casimir*, and his successors, that it obtained the second place among the Reformed Churches; and the *Form of Instruction*, which was composed for its use by *Ursinus*, in 1563, and which is known under the title of the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, was almost universally adopted by the Calvinists. For an account of this Catechism, which may be found in the Oxford *Sylloge Confessionum*, see Kocheri *Bibl. Theol. Symbolicæ*, pp. 593, and 308.

Towards the end of the same century, the doctrine and dis-

France,[1] Prussia,[2] and Holland,[3] at an early period of the Reformation, and were introduced into Britain in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,[4] by those divines who fled to Switzerland, &c. to escape the bloody persecutions under Queen Mary. But the political, and I may add, the fanatical, conduct of the Puritans, or of that faction of the Puritans, (who were all rigid Calvinists,) which overturned the church, and murdered their king, brought Cal-

cipline of Geneva were also embraced by other German states, the city of Bremen, &c.

[1] Dr Mosheim, speaking of the French Protestant Churches, says, that about the middle of the 16th century, "they all, without exception, entered into the bonds of fraternal communion with the Church of Geneva."—*Eccles. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 384.—For the writers that have given the best accounts of the French Reformed Churches, their Confession of Faith, and their forms of worship and discipline, Dr Mosheim refers us to Kocherus, in his *Bibl. Theol. Symbol.* p. 299.

[2] "In Prussia, the *Reformed* gained ground after the death of Luther and Melancthon, and founded the flourishing churches that still subsist in that country."—*Mosheim.* They also propagated their tenets, about the same time, in Poland, &c.

[3] The religious system of Calvin was publicly adopted in the Belgic Provinces about the year 1571, or at latest in 1579, when the *Belgic Confession*, which made its first appearance in 1561, was confirmed in a public synod. And in the famous *Synod of Dort*, A. D. 1618, the same system was fixed as the national and established religion of the Seven United Provinces.

[4] *i. e.* The Calvinistical tenets, in regard to church government and discipline, were then first introduced into Britain; for it would appear from Latimer's *Sermons*, Fox's *Acts*, &c. that several Protestants who suffered under Queen Mary, were Doctrinal Calvinists.

vinism, already in its wane, into total disrepute with the friends of monarchy in England. It has, however, maintained its ground there more or less ever since; but, since the restoration, chiefly among the Dissenters. In Scotland, no moderation was observed in the work of reformation, and various attempts were made to introduce Calvinism and Presbyterianism, from the days of John Knox, till the Revolution in 1688, when both were established; and at the union of the two kingdoms, the religion of Scotland, as then established, was confirmed.

But though the seeds of Calvinism were thus industriously and early sown in different countries of Europe, there does not seem to have been any great degree of unanimity among its professors in those countries; nor had any reformed Church, before the *Synod of Dort*, "obliged its members, by any special law or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of Geneva, relating to the primary causes of the salvation of the elect, or the ruin of the reprobate."

It is also worthy of remark, that the authority of that synod was far from being universally acknowledged even among the Dutch; and it is doubtful whether the victory gained by it over the Arminians,[1] was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the cause of the successful party.

"It is at least certain, that after the Synod of

[1] See the Article *Arminianism*, below.

Dort, the doctrine of absolute decrees lost ground from day to day; and its patrons were put to the hard necessity of holding fraternal communion with those whose doctrine was either professedly Arminian, or at least nearly resembled it." [1]

See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* and Neale's *History of the Puritans.* Maimbourg's *Histoire du Calvinisme*, "is remarkable for nothing," says Mosheim, "but the partiality of its author, and the wilful errors with which it abounds." A work bearing the same title, and which is chiefly a criticism on this last, was written in 2 vols., by the famous P. Bayle.

Neale's work also should be read with great caution, but not as adopting the faults of Maimbourg, for Mr Neale's partiality and errors lean to the other side.

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINES.—The leading tenets of Calvinism have been reduced to these five—*Particular Election*,—*Particular Redemption*,—*Moral inability in a fallen state*,—*Irresistible Grace*, and the *Final Perseverance of the Saints.* These are termed, by theologians, *the five points*; and ever since the Synod of *Dort*, when they were the subjects of discussion between the Calvinists and Arminians, frequent have been the controversies agitated respecting them. Even the Calvinists themselves differ in the explication of them; it cannot therefore be

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 412, and V. pp. 336, 8.

expected that a very specific account of them should be given here. Generally speaking, however, they comprehend the following propositions:——

1*st*, That God has chosen a *certain number* in Christ to everlasting glory, before the foundation of the world, according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love, without the least foresight of faith, good works, or any conditions performed by the creatures, and that the rest of mankind he was pleased to *pass by*, and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his vindictive justice. [1]

2*dly*, That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement *only* for the sins of the *Elect*. [2]

3*dly*, That mankind are *totally depraved* in consequence of the fall; and, by virtue of Adam's

[1] The Calvinistical doctrine of *Predestination*, or of the *Divine Decrees*, may be seen unfolded in the 3*d* Chap. of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. The controversy which has had this doctrine for its object, has exhibited in some of those who have engaged in it, an insatiable desire of sounding the deepest mysteries, and of being *wise above what is written*. Hence, the most subtle researches concerning the nature of the divine attributes, particularly those of *justice* and *goodness*; the doctrine of *fate* or *necessity*; the origin of *evil*; the connection between *human liberty*, and *divine prescience*, &c. &c.

[2] They believe in the *all-sufficiency* of our Lord's redemption for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, but they deny its universality of *intention* or *operation*. See Calvin on St John, iii. 15, and *Acta Synodi Dordrechtanæ*, Ses. *136, p.* 250.

being their public head, *the guilt* of his sin was *imputed*, and a corrupt nature conveyed to all his posterity, from which proceed all actual transgression; and that by sin we are made subject to death, and all miseries, temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

4thly, That all whom God has predestinated to life, he is pleased, in his appointed time, *effectually* to call by his word and spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ.

And *5thly*, That those whom God has effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, shall *never finally* fall from a state of grace.[1]

The most prominent feature of this system is, the election of some, and the passing by or *reprobation*[2] of others.—"The Calvinists consider the decree of election, by which God chose out of the whole body of mankind certain persons, who are called the Elect, to whom in due season are effectually applied the means of their being delivered from corruption, as absolute, or arising entirely from the good pleasure of God. They consider the decree of reprobation including two acts, Preterition and Condemnation, as also absolute."[3]

[1] For some of the texts of Scripture alleged in proof of these five heads of doctrine, and the decisions at Dort in regard to them, see Mr Fuller's edit. of Hannah Adams's *View of Religions*, *Art. Calvinists.*

[2] Quos Deus præterit, reprobat.—*Calvin.*

[3] Dr Hill's *Theol. Institutes*, p. 95.

A distinguished Calvinist, who refers on this head to Fr.

On the 2d of the above points, holding that the destination of the death of Christ respected only such as shall finally be saved by him, they argue from such passages as John x. 11. xv. 12. 13. 14; Ephes. v. 25. And they rest in this destination to save those only who shall be saved, as more worthy of the sovereignty of God, and as taught by our Lord.[1] John, vi. 37, 38, 39.

For a full statement of their sentiments on the 3d point, see President Edwards "*On Original*

Turretini *Theol.* Loc. 4. Qu. 14. Sect. 89, remarks here, in illustration of Dr Hill, that, "as far as I understand the doctrine, while they hold that God acts sovereignly in *preterition*, or, in other words, that he does not pass by the rest of mankind as being in themselves more unworthy than the objects of his choice; they at the same time teach, that the decree of *precondemnation*, as its end proposes the glory of divine justice, must be viewed as proceeding on the ground of their being transgressors of the law, and therefore amenable to justice. That is, he does not in his eternal purpose condemn them simply as his creatures, but as rebels against his authority, both in Adam and in their own persons, whether as sinning against the law of nature, or against the light of revelation. In *preterition* he sustains the character of the Supreme Sovereign; in *precondemnation*, of a righteous judge."

[1] Dr Hill, p. 90.

Dr Mosheim remarks, that the early fathers "never presumed, before Augustine, to set limits to the extent of the divine grace and mercy."—*Eccles. Hist.* Vol. V. p. 370. Mr Milner also, in Vol. II. p. 506 of his *Hist. of the Church of Christ*, says, "The notion of particular redemption was unknown to the ancients; and I wish it had remained equally unknown to the moderns."

That such a notion has not remained unknown to us, is per-

Sin." With regard to the *4th*, they "consider the grace connected with salvation, as confined to those whom God hath chosen;—as a supernatural influence exerted by the Creator upon the faculties of the human mind, which, deriving its efficacy from the power of God fulfilling his purpose, never can fail of its effect; and which produces, in a manner that they do not pretend to explain, (John, iii. 8.) but ordinarily with the use of means, and always in a consistency with the reasonable nature of man, that change which is the work of the Spirit." And on the *fifth* point they hold, that "this grace does not preserve any man in this state from every kind of sin; but that those to whom it is given, cannot fall from it either finally or totally." And, according to their

haps matter of regret; and that it should be not only known to the moderns, but warmly maintained by many eminent and pious men among them, would be to the *Ante*-Augustinian fathers, were they to know it, doubtless matter of surprise. For there are several sects of Christians, I suspect, that cannot produce, in proof of the grand and leading dogmas of their respective systems, so many or so express texts of Scripture as those on which rests the doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, or that Christ died for *all*.—Ex uno disce omnes. St Paul, writing to Timothy, says, that God our Saviour "will have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For," adds the apostle, "there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all*."—1 Tim. ii. 4. 5. 6.

See the *Doctrine of Universal Redemption asserted and explained*, in four very able Sermons on 1 Tim. iv. 10. by the famous Dr Barrow.

system, "assurance of grace and salvation is possible."[1]

The order in which they understand the divine decrees, has produced two distinctions of Calvinists, viz. *Sublapsarians*, and *Supralapsarians:* the former term derived from two Latin words, *sub*, below or after, and *lapsus*, the fall; and the latter from *supra*, above, and *lapsus*, the fall.

The *Sublapsarians* assert, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without absolutely predetermining his fall; their system of decrees, concerning election and reprobation, being, as it were, subsequent to that event:—whereas the *Supralapsarians* maintain, that God had from all eternity *decreed* the transgression of Adam, in such a manner that our first parents could not possibly avoid that fatal event, and this as a foundation for the display of his justice and mercy.[2] But, as Dr Priestley remarks, if we admit the divine prescience, there is not, in fact, any real difference between the two schemes, and accordingly that distinction is now less frequently mentioned. They are thus stated by Dr Doddridge in his *Lectures*:——

"The *Supralapsarian* and *Sublapsarian* schemes

[1] Dr Hill, p. 98, 99. 118.

The notion of many Calvinists is, that man is wholly destitute of grace, until that time arrives when the converting and sanctifying Spirit of God visits him; and that the smallest particle of this grace is a sure pledge of a further communication of it, and of the final salvation of the recipient.

[2] See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. V. p. 366.

agree in asserting the doctrine of predestination, but with this difference, that the *former* supposes that God intended to glorify his justice in the condemnation of some, as well as his mercy in the salvation of others; and for that purpose *decreed*, that Adam should *necessarily* fall, and by that fall bring himself and all his offspring into a state of everlasting condemnation: the *latter* scheme supposes, that the decree of predestination regards man as fallen, by an abuse of that freedom which Adam had, into a state, in which all were to be left to necessary and unavoidable ruin, who were not exempted from it by predestination."[1] The Doctor adds, that "the chief difficulties which may be urged against the former scheme, do likewise attend the latter."

Those divines who seem to have gone to the height of *Supralapsarianism*, were Calvin, Beza, and Twisse, who was prolocutor to the assembly of divines at Westminster in 1643; and more lately Mr Brine and Dr Gill: and it is said that these two, with Mr Hussey of Cambridge, have carried their singularities so far as to disclaim all addresses and exhortations to sinners.[2]

[1] Vol. II. p. 288, fourth edition.

[2] Bishop Burnet on the 17*th Article*. See also the *Anal. Review* for 1788, p. 220.

Calvinists in general, I believe, do not consider predestination as affecting the agency or accountableness of men, or as being to them any rule of conduct. On the contrary, they suppose them to act as freely, and to be as much the proper subjects of calls, warnings, exhortations, promises, and threatenings, as if no decree existed.—See CALVIN's *Inst.* Lib. II. c. 5. s. 4.; and Lib. III. c. 22. s. 10.

Many Sublapsarians, struck doubtless with the force of those texts which set no limits to the object of Christ's death, reject the second leading article of their creed, and hold *Universal Redemption*. And of those others who do not profess to hold this doctrine, some, and among the rest even Calvin himself, occasionally drop such expressions as cannot well be construed in a way consistently with that article, or otherwise than as admitting or implying the doctrine in question.[1]

"In England, the *first reformers* were generally in the Sublapsarian hypothesis; but Perkins and others asserted the Supralapsarian way."[2]

The Calvinistic system includes in it,—the doctrines of a Trinity in Unity, and of an atonement. With respect to the latter the Calvinists hold, that Christ, the eternal Son of God, in our nature, and acting as surety for the elect, suffered all that divine wrath that was due to them as transgressors of the law. Divine justice required its

[1] See Calvin on St Matthew, xx. 28.; chap xxvi. 28.; and Heb. ix. 28. On the second of these texts he says,—"Sub multorum nomine non partem mundi tantum designat, sed *totum genus humanum*." And on the third,—"Multos dicit *pro omnibus*, sicut ad Rom. v. 15. Certum quidem est non omnes ex Christi morte fructum percipere; sed hoc ideo fit quia eos impedit sua incredulitas."

See also DALLÆUS'S *Apology against Spanheim*; POOL'S *Annotation on Heb. ii. 9.*, &c.——"Expellas naturam" &c.

[2] Bishop Burnet on the 17*th Article*, to which the reader is referred, as being generally allowed to contain a brief, full, and fair representation of what is found in the writings of both parties on this subject.

victim either in the sinner, or his substitute: Jesus became the surety; he paid the debt, and satisfied the demand.

Justification by faith alone, and the imputed righteousness of Christ, also form an essential part of the same system.[1]—Calvinists suppose, that, on the one hand, our sins are imputed to Christ; and, on the other, that we are justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, *i. e.* we, the guilty, are treated by God as righteous persons, out of regard to what Christ has done and suffered: who, though perfectly innocent, was appointed to suffer by the imputation of our sins to him; and the punishment inflicted on him was requisite to the plenary payment of an infinite debt. Calvin, Beza, &c. even held, "that Christ went to the place of the damned, and suffered their *pains*; and that it was highly proper he should do so, in order to complete the redemption of mankind."[2]

Calvin states, and defends at large, the principles of his system in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which have long held in the reformed churches the same rank, authority, and credit, that the *Loci Communes* of Melancthon obtained among the Lutherans. And both he and his followers refer, in proof of their peculiar sentiments, to St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and the other epistolary writings, more frequently than to any other part of the New Testament;

[1] See page 241. of this article, Note 1.

[2] Dr Hey's *Nor. Lect.* Vol. II. p. 373.

on the ground, I presume, that the epistles were written after the descent of the Holy Ghost, who was promised to guide the apostles into all truth.

The chief advantage of their doctrines, we are told, is, to produce in us a *most reverential awe* when we look up to God, and the *profoundest humility* when we look down upon ourselves.

But however this may be, and "whatever may be our opinion of the speculative and highly metaphysical tenets of Calvinism, it is but justice to this sect to observe, that its members are in general *exemplary for their piety and virtue.*" [1]

The chief Calvinistic Confessions, Catechisms, &c. are, the *Belgic and Westminster Confessions of Faith*;—Calvin's *Catechism*;—the *Heidelberg Catechism*;—the Westminster Assembly's *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*;—the *Acts and Canons of the Synod of Dort*, &c. &c.

In these, and in Calvin's *Institutes*, Turretin's several works, [2] and Dr Gill's *Body of Divinity*, the Calvinistic system may be found very fully detailed.

For much of what has been said on the other side, see Archbishop King's *Sermon on Predestination*, 8vo, 1709;—Mr Ludlam's *Two Essays on Justification, and the influences of the Holy Spirit*;—Dr Thomas Edward's (of Coventry's) work, entitled, *The Doctrine of Irresistible Grace proved*

[1] *Monthly Review*, March 1806, Vol. XLIX. p. 314.

[2] Turretini *Opera Theol.* 4 vol. 4to, 1696; his *Compend. Theologiæ*, 8vo, 1731; and his *Institutiones Theologiæ*, 2 vol. 4to, 1736.

to have no Foundation in the writings of the New Testament;—Dr Whitby on the *Five Points*.

See also the Article *Arminianism* below.

In the *Theses of Saumur* and *Le Blanc*, may be seen the *mean* between Calvinism and Arminianism.

WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, &c.—Calvin was himself no enemy to public liturgies, yet all forms are laid aside, and extemporary prayer is used, by most of his followers, except the Dutch, in whose church an ordinary form of prayer, and the use of forms for the celebration of the sacraments, are established. He confined the privilege of communion to pious and regenerate believers; but the strict church-discipline which he introduced at Geneva, in this and other respects, is now no more.[1] The Established Calvinists adopt, as already observed, the presbyterian form of government; but many Societies, who generally profess the Calvinistic doctrines, are Independents, or Congregationalists, as to church government, and have a form of discipline peculiar to themselves.

Calvinists have retained but few rites, or ceremonies. The custom of Confirmation was approved, as apostolical, both by Luther and Calvin, and several of their followers, yet those of the

[1] A melancholy account of the state of religion in Geneva, in 1785, is given in the first volume of Dr Erskine's *Sketches of Church History*, p. 232, &c.

latter abolished it, as having been abused. "But I am credibly informed," says Archbishop Secker, "that at Geneva it hath lately been restored."[1]

The Dutch observe, in their church, Christmas-day, Easter-day, Ascension-day, and Whitsunday; but almost all other Calvinists have laid aside the observation even of these festivals, as well as of all saints' days whatsoever.

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, &c.—The Calvinists are not formed into any distinct society, but are to be found among Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, &c. Calvinism is said to be the religion, not only of Geneva, but also of all the Protestant Swiss; but this must be understood with some limitation; for though they are Presbyterians as to church government, in some doctrinal points they are far from being universally Calvinists. We are told, that even the "Genevese have now, *in fact*, quitted their Calvinistic doctrines, though in form they retain them; one reason for retaining the form is, lest they should be thought *Heretics* by the *Dutch churches*. This is however only a *tacit* reformation. There seems still to be some obligation to read public lectures at Geneva, on *Calvin's Catechism;* but the lecturers confine themselves to a part of it, and soon pass on to something else.

[1] *Sermon on Confirmation.* If so, I should be glad to learn by whom, and in what manner, it is there performed, as no one but bishops, the German Lutherans excepted, ever pretended to confirm.

The youth are chiefly taught *Ostervald's Catechism*, which seems to contain what may now be called the *real* religion of Geneva."[1]

Calvinism has been the prevailing religion of the United Provinces ever since 1572 till the late revolution;[2] but Arminianism was tolerated, and increased even after the *Synod of Dort*. And, in Germany, the Calvinists, Arminians, and Lutherans, are mixed with the Romanists; the different religions prevailing in different places, and in different degrees; but the Calvinists chiefly on the Rhine.

The three established churches are said to have approached each other of late, in many places of the German empire, and particularly the Lutherans and the Calvinists: the distinctions which had originally separated them, both in doctrine and external rites, having begun to disappear.

In France, Calvinism was abolished by the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685; but it is still professed there by almost all the reformed. In

[1] Dr Hey's *Norris. Lect.* Vol. II. p. 57.

We now "see the city of *Geneva*," says Mosheim, "which was the parent, the nurse, and the guardian of the doctrine of *Absolute Predestination*, and *Particular Grace*, not only put on sentiments of charity, forbearance, and esteem, for the Arminians, but become itself almost so far Arminian, as to deserve a place among the churches of that communion."—*Eccles. Hist.* Vol. V. p. 371.

[2] The Dutch, in general, warmly maintained the doctrines of the *Synod of Dort*, and none but Calvinists held any places of trust or profit.

the Danish territories it has a great number of votaries; and its professors there enjoy great freedom of opinion, though in some places they are not allowed to make proselytes, or to preach against those who profess other doctrines.—They are also to be met with in great numbers in Prussia; but they are said to have scarcely any congregations in Russia, except at Riga and St Petersburg. In Hungary they have about 1300 churches, and 1340 ministers, divided into four dioceses or districts. They there possess equal rights with the Lutherans, and have their own colleges, the principal of which is that at *Saros Patak*.

Calvinism forms the established religion in Scotland, where it is also professed by a great majority of the dissenters; and in England it is taught in all the chapels of Mr Whitfield and Lady Huntingdon, and the Particular Baptists, and in many of those of the Presbyterians and Independents. It is also professed by these three last denominations in general, and by various others, in Ireland, America, &c.[1]

Without taking notice of others who are professed Calvinists, it must hence appear, that they form a numerous body; yet different people seem disposed, from different motives, to add to their number; for, while many Calvinists are wont to claim several orthodox tenets, such as original

[1] There are two seceding synods in Ireland, whereof the members are all Calvinists; but it is thought that Arminianism predominates among the Presbyterians in that country, and perhaps in America also, as well as in England.

sin, the atonement, sanctification, and justification by the sole merits of Christ, as entirely their own, some Arminians have shewn themselves extremely unguarded in styling all men *Calvinists* who hold those doctrines.—The chief universities, in which the doctrine of Calvin has been taught, are, besides the Scotch universities, those of Geneva, Leyden, Franeker, Utrecht, &c.

EMINENT MEN, AND AUTHORS PRO AND CON. —Among the more distinguished followers of Calvin may be ranked the names of Beza, Diodati, Mestrezat, Spanheim, the Tronchins, the Turretins, and Pictet, all of them of Geneva, and all names familiar to the learned. And to these may be added those of Gomarus, Dallæus, Blondell, Salmasius, Claude, Owen, Henry, Gill, Guise, Edwards, Toplady, Watts, Doddridge, Whitfield, &c. &c.

Their party have had lately to contend with *Socinians*, as well as with *Arminians*. Their champion against the former is Mr *Fuller*, who, in a work entitled *The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems compared*,[1] has endeavoured to defend their system from the absurdities and impieties with which it has been charged in the writings of modern Socinians. His criticisms are chiefly directed against Dr Priestley and Mr T. Belsham,

[1] See above p. 199.—This work, which is well thought of by more indifferent readers, has been admired by some Calvinists, and condemned by others of them, as not coming up to the *full standard* of orthodoxy.

who have not condescended to notice them; but Dr Toulmin and Mr Kentish have come forward and bestowed upon them some animadversions, to which their antagonist has replied.

Against the Arminians of the Church of England, Mr Overton of York has defended the cause of Calvinism, in his *True Churchman ascertained;* a work which has been warmly attacked by the present Dean of Peterborough, and the Archdeacon of Sarum. The Anti-Jacobin Reviewers have also taken the same side of the question; and, in their review of Mr Overton's work, have appeared as able and strenuous advocates for the Anti-Calvinism of the Church of England.[1]

One of the most able defenders of the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination, both upon philosophical and Christian principles, is Mr Jonathan Edwards, in his *Enquiry into the Freedom of the Will*, and his *History of the Work of Redemption;*[2] and the same sentiments are contended for by Mr Toplady, in his *Doctrine of Absolute Predestination stated and asserted*,—in his *Letter to John Wesley*,—in his *More Work for Mr J. Wesley*, and in his *Scheme of Christian and Philosophical Necessity.* Sir Richard Hill, in his *Review*

[1] See *Anti-Jacobin Review* for 1804.—Mr Overton is not the first who has maintained the Calvinism of the church, for Mr Toplady published a work, entitled, *An Historic Proof of the Calvinism of the Church of England.*

[2] "The most formidable Calvinist of *modern times* I take to be Jonathan Edwards of New Jersey."—Dr Hey's *Nor. Lect.* Vol. IV. p. 6.

of Mr Wesley's Doctrines, in his *Logica Wesleiensis*, and in his *Strictures on Mr Fletcher*, is another defender of Calvinism. And to these may be added Mr T. Williams, in his *Vindication of the Calvinistic Doctrines of Depravity, the Atonement, Divine Influence*, &c.

See also a work entitled *Examen du Livre, qui porte pour titre prejugees legitimes contre les Calvinistes*. Haye, 12mo, 1683. This last work was written by Nicole, a Roman Catholic; and the author of the *Examen* was the famous Claude Pajon, a French Protestant, and a moderate divine, who leaned somewhat towards the Arminian System; a "propensity," says Dr M'Laine, "that was not uncommon among the French Protestants."

On the other side, the Arminian tenets are vindicated by Mr Wesley, in his *Predestination calmly considered*, and in other parts of his writings; and also by his friend Mr Fletcher of Madeley, in his *Checks to Antinomianism*, and in several additional publications.

See also Dr Jortin's *Six Dissertations*, No. 1. and 2., and Dr Tower's *Review of the Genuine Doctrines of Christianity; comprehending Remarks on several principal Calvinistic Doctrines*, &c.

I conclude this article in the words of a pious and agreeable writer:—"It is usual with men, either to entertain ideas of divine goodness which are derogatory to perfect holiness and justice, or to exalt these latter attributes, taken in conjunc-

tion with absolute sovereignty, to the prejudice of that mercy which is revealed in Scripture, and is also not obscurely indicated in nature and providence; a proceeding which tends, in the one case, to inspire the mind with presumption, and, in the other, to sink it in despondence; and nothing can be of more importance than to guard equally against both these extremes."[1]

[1] Bates' *Rural Philosophy*, Pref. p. 26.

ARMINIANISM,

AND

ARMINIANS.

NAMES.—Those who maintain the doctrines in regard to Predestination and Grace, that were embraced, and ably defended, by *James Harmensen* or *Arminius*, an eminent Protestant divine, and a native of *Oude-Water*, in Holland, who flourished at the beginning of the 17th century, have been, since that period, called by his name.

The term *Arminian*, however, like many others in current use, is doubtless less appropriate; for though it, of course, did not exist at the Reformation, the doctrines were not then unknown, which were afterwards distinguished by it. *Bolsec* is said to have taught them even at Geneva in 1551; and they have no doubt many professors at this day, who will not scruple to assert that they are coeval with Christianity itself.

The same religionists have also been called *Remonstrants*, particularly on the continent, be-

cause, in 1610, they presented an humble petition, entitled their *Remonstrance*, to the States of Holland, in which they state their grievances, and pray for relief.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—Arminius, from whom are derived the origin and the name, but not the doctrines of the sect, who was born in 1560, and died in 1609, first studied at Leyden, and then at Geneva. After visiting Italy, and spending some time at Padua, he was admitted to the exercise of the ministry at Amsterdam, and was called to the divinity chair at Leyden in 1603.

When at the university of Geneva, he studied under Beza, by whom he was instructed in the doctrines of Calvin; and having been judged by Martin Lydius, professor of divinity at *Franeker*, a fit person to refute a work, in which the Calvinistic doctrine of *Predestination* had been attacked by some ministers of *Delft*, he undertook the task: but, upon strict examination of the reasons on both sides, he became a convert to the opinions which he was employed to refute, and afterwards went still farther than the ministers of Delft had done. The result of his enquiries on this, and other subjects connected with it, was, that, thinking the doctrine of Calvin, with regard to freewill, predestination, and grace, too severe, he began to express his doubts respecting them in the year 1591, and at last adopted the religious system of those who extend the love of God, and the merits of his Son, to all mankind.

After his appointment to the theological chair at Leyden, he thought it his duty to avow and vindicate the principles which he had embraced; and the freedom with which he published and defended them, exposed him to the resentment of those that adhered to the theological system of Calvin, which then prevailed in Holland; but his principal opponent was *Gomar* his colleague.—The controversy, thus begun, became more general after the death of Arminius, and threatened to involve the United Provinces in civil discord. Disputes ran high, and on each side considerable talents and learning were displayed. The Arminian tenets, however, gained ground, under the mild and favourable treatment of the Magistrates of Holland, and were adopted by several persons of merit and distinction; but the Calvinists, or *Gomarists*, as they were now called, appealed to a national Synod, and accordingly a Synod was convened by order of the States General at *Dordrecht* or *Dort*.[1] It was composed of ecclesiastical and lay-deputies from the United Provinces, and also of ecclesiastical deputies from the reformed Churches of *England*, *Switzerland*, *Bremen*, *Hesse*, and the *Palatinate*, and it sat from 1st Nov. 1618, to 26th April 1619.

In this Synod, in which politics got mixed with

[1] It was not, however, with the unanimous consent of the States that this Synod assembled; for three of the Seven Provinces protested against the holding of it, viz. *Holland*, *Utrecht*, and *Overyssel*.

religion, the principal advocate in favour of the Arminians was *Episcopius*, who was then professor of divinity at Leyden. It had scarcely commenced its proceedings, when a dispute arose on the mode of proceeding, which drove the Arminian party from the assembly; they having insisted on beginning with a refutation of the Calvinistic doctrines, especially that of *reprobation*, whilst the other party determined, that, as the remonstrants were accused of departing from the reformed faith, they ought first to justify themselves by scriptural proof of their own opinions.

All means to persuade the Arminians to submit to this procedure having failed, they were banished the Synod for their refusal;—their cause was tried in their absence;—and they were pronounced guilty of pestilential errors, and condemned as corrupters of the true religion. In consequence of this decision, which Mosheim seems to think was premeditated and determined even before the meeting of the Synod, they were considered as enemies to their country, and its established religion, and were exposed to much persecution.—They were treated with great severity, and deprived of all their posts and employments;—their ministers were silenced, and their congregations suppressed. The great *Barneveldt* lost his life on a public scaffold; and the learned Grotius, being condemned to perpetual imprisonment, made his escape and took refuge in France.

But the authority of this Synod was far from being universally acknowledged, either in Holland

or in Britain; for the provinces of *Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guilderland,* and *Groningen,* could not be persuaded to adopt their decisions; and they were opposed by King James I. and Archbishop Laud, in England. Nor would the Churches of Bremen and Brandenburg, which made a considerable figure among the *Reformed* in Germany, ever suffer their doctors to be tied down to the opinions and tenets of the Dutch divines, as maintained in this assembly. But whether in condemning the opinions, and excommunicating the persons of the Arminians, it acted justly or unjustly, yet surely few will be found who can approve of the persecution which followed, and which drove these men from their churches and their country into exile and poverty. However, after the death of Prince Maurice, A. D. 1625, who had been a violent partizan in favour of the Gomarists, the Arminian exiles were restored to their former reputation and tranquillity; and, under the toleration of the States, which was granted them in 1630, they erected churches, and founded a college at *Amsterdam,* appointing Episcopius the first theological professor. This seminary has from time to time produced some able divines and excellent scholars; and among others may be mentioned the names of Courcelles, Poelenburg, Limborch, Le Clerk, Cattenburgh, and Wetstein, all of them his successors in the theological chair. But the Arminians there have been exposed to occasional persecutions; and the external lustre of their community is said to have

been long on the decline. This, however, cannot be said of the credit and influence of their religious principles even in Holland; for they have "insinuated themselves more or less into the bosom of the established Church, and infected the theological system of many of those pastors who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the Synod of Dort;"[1] and, it may be added, of the *Westminster Assembly*.

The early introduction of Arminian principles into various other countries, as *Britain*, *France*, *Geneva*, and many parts of *Switzerland*, is abundantly known; but their progress is said to have been somewhat retarded of late, more especially in Germany and several parts of Switzerland, by the prevalence of the Leibnitian and Wolfian Philosophy, which is more favourable to Calvinism.[2]

See an interesting work entitled, "An abridgment of Gerard Brandt's *History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*," in 2 vols. 8vo. 1725.

A curious account of the proceedings of the Synod of Dort may also be seen in a series of *Letters*, written by the ever-memorable John Hales of Eaton, who was present on the occasion, and relates with candour and simplicity what he saw and heard.

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINES.—The original

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 464.

[2] See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 464.—Note (ee)

difference between the Arminians and the Calvinists was entirely confined to the *five points*,[1] relative to the doctrines of Predestination and Grace; and it was the doctrine of the former concerning these points alone that occasioned their condemnation in the Synod of *Dort*.

The distinguishing tenets of the Arminians may therefore be said to consist chiefly in the different light in which they view the subjects of those points, or in the different explanation which they give to them, and are comprised in the five following articles; relating to—*Predestination*—*Universal Redemption*—the *Corruption of Human Nature*—*Conversion*, and *Perseverance*.

1. With respect to the *first*, they maintained, —"That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting punishments on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist to the end his divine assistance:—so that election was conditional, and reprobation, in like manner, the result of foreseen infidelity and persevering wickedness."

2. On the *second* point, they taught,—"That Jesus Christ by his sufferings and death, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that, however, none but those who believe in him, can be partakers of their divine benefit."

[1] See above, p. 228, 9.

3. On the *third* article they held,—"That *true faith* cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing: and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be *regenerated* and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ."[*]

4. On the *fourth*, they believed,—"That divine grace, or the energy of the Holy Ghost, begins and perfects every thing that can be called good in man, and consequently all good works are to be attributed to God alone;—that, nevertheless, this grace is offered to all, and does not force men to act against their inclinations, but

[*] So Drs Heylin and Mosheim, &c.; and this doctrine seems to correspond with what Arminius himself maintains in his *Declaration*, and in his *Public Disputations*, Thesis 7, &c.

But if this be the Arminian doctrine, is it not at the same time that of the Calvinists? And if so, whence could the subject of this article have become a ground of dispute, in the Synod of Dort?—I have not yet seen this point cleared up to my mind, and still desire farther satisfaction.

This article, (as held, I presume, by many later Arminians,) is thus expressed by Dr Gregory and others,—"That mankind are not totally depraved, and that depravity does not come upon them by virtue of Adam's being their public head; but that mortality and natural evil only are the direct consequences of his sin to posterity."

may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.[1]

5. And, on the *fifth*,—"That God gives to the truly faithful who are regenerated by his grace, the means of preserving themselves in this state;" and though the first Arminians had some doubt with respect to the closing part of this article, their followers uniformly maintain, "that the regenerate may lose true justifying faith—fall from a state of grace, and die in their sins."[2]

Thus, the followers of Arminius believe that God, having an equal regard for all his creatures, sent his Son to die for the sins, not of the *elect* only, but of the *whole world*;—that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree, but that the misery of those that perish comes from themselves; and,—that in this present imperfect state, believers, if not peculiarly vigilant, may, through the force of temptation, and the influence of Satan, fall from grace, and sink into final perdition.

These sentiments they found "on the expressions of our Saviour, respecting his *willingness* to save *all* that come unto him;—especially on his

[1] This article, as well as the former, is interpreted by some modern Arminians with a greater latitude.

[2] These five articles are thus briefly expressed by Lampe in his *Synopsis Hist. Sacræ*,—"Prædestinationis decretum non esse absolutum:—meritum Christi esse universale:—liberum arbitrium non prædeterminari:—gratiæ operationem in conversione non esse irresistibilem:—vere fideles posse verâ fide excidere."

prayer over Jerusalem;—on his sermon on the mount; and above all,—on his delineation of the process of the last day, where the salvation of men is not said to have been procured by any *decree*, but because "they had done the will of their Father, who is in heaven." This last argument they deem decisive, because it cannot be supposed that our Lord, in the account of the judgment day, would have deceived them. They also say, that the terms respecting Election in the Epistle to the Romans, are applicable only to the state of the Jews *as a body*, without any reference to the religious condition of individuals, either in this world, or the next."[1]

But as the Arminians are not authoritatively bound to adhere closely to these articles, or indeed to any particular form of confession, much misconception seems to exist on the subject of the Arminian doctrine. Yet nothing but mere prejudice, or the grossest ignorance, can lead any to confound it with that of Socinus, or even with that of Pelagius; and of course to associate its professors with Pelagians and Socinians, as is not unfrequently done by many Calvinists and others, from whom better things might be expected. For this system, which maintains the doctrine of human depravity—salvation by Christ—justification by faith, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, stands on very different grounds from that of either the Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians. It may,

[1] Mr Evans's *Sketch*.

notwithstanding, be admitted, that there have not been wanting some who have sheltered their Pelagian, nor others perhaps even their Socinian, errors, under the name of Arminianism.

See a *Confession of Faith*, drawn up by Episcopius, and expressed for the most part in words and phrases of Holy Scripture, which the Arminians have generally adopted, though it is not enjoined upon them by any law or authoritative obligation.

See also Bishop Burnet's Exposition of the 17th Article of the Church of England, and Dr Heylin's *Hist. Quinquarticularis*, or *History of the Five Points*, more particularly of their reception and progress in England. [1]

WORSHIP AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT.—"The external forms of divine worship and ecclesiastical government in the Arminian Church, are al-

[1] The theological student will also find the Arminian system and principles still more fully detailed in—

Curcellæi Opera, fol. 1675. Binchii *Mellificium Theologicum*, 4to, 1657. *Episcopii Opera*, 2 vols. fol. 1660. Limborch *Theol. Christiana*, fol. 1695. Bishop Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica*, and Le Blanc's *Theses Theol.* fol. 1683; which last work seems to hold the balance even between the Arminian and Calvinistic doctrine. The works of Arminius were collected and published at *Franckfort*, A. D. 1631 and 1634, in one vol. 4to.; but a pretty just and accurate notion of his doctrine and character may be formed from his *Disputationes Publicæ et Privatæ.* Lugd. 1610, &c.—The most ample account of his life is given by Brandt, in his *Hist. Vitæ Jac. Arminii*, Leyd. 8vo. 1724.—See Dr Mosheim's edit. of this work at Brunswick, 1725.

most the same with those that are in use among the Presbyterians. As, however, the leading men among the Arminians are peculiarly ambitious of maintaining their correspondence and fraternal intercourse with the Church of England, and leave no circumstance unimproved that may tend to confirm this union; so they discover, upon all occasions, their approbation of the Episcopal form of ecclesiastical government, and profess to regard it as most ancient, as truly sacred, and as superior to all other institutions of Church polity."[1]

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND—EMINENT MEN—WRITERS PRO AND CON., &c.—The Arminians are still a distinct sect from the establishment in the United Provinces; where, says Mosheim, they have thirty-four congregations more or less numerous, which are furnished with eighty-four pastors. Besides these, their church at *Frederickstadt*, in the Dutchy of Holstein, still subsists.[2] They are also to be found in most countries, and

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 465. This language of Dr M. seems to insinuate, that the Arminians are not very sincere in these professions; and there is no doubt some ground for such an insinuation, if they do not universally adopt, and adhere to, what they thus profess to approve and admire.

[2] While, after the Synod of *Dort*, many Arminians retired to Antwerp, and others fled to France, &c. a considerable number, accepting the invitation sent to them by *Frederick*, Duke of *Holstein*, formed a colony, which settled in the dominions of that prince, and built for themselves a handsome town in South

among many denominations of Christians, both in Europe and America.

Ever since the days of Archbishop Laud, *i. e.* from the time of King Charles the First, by far the greater part of the Clergy of the establishment in England have taken this side of the question, and the term Arminian is applied by many as descriptive of the doctrines of the Church of England. As far as it indicates the rejection of the Calvinistic hypothesis of predestination, reprobation, and particular redemption, by the generality of the members of that church, it is doubtless applied with justice. But if it is used for imputing to the Church of England any approach towards the fundamental errors, into which many eminent Arminians on the continent have fallen since the Synod of Dort, it is by no means applicable; for their theological system underwent a considerable change soon after that period, and embraced many persons whose opinions respecting the person of Christ,—the necessity of the

Jutland, on the Eyder, which they called by his name, where they still live happy and unmolested, in the open profession and free exercise of their religion. They may also have public schools and a printing office; and one half the number of magistrates must be chosen from among them. The other half are Lutherans.—It does not appear that the Arminians in Holland had gotten into popular favour in Dr Hammond's time; for he remarks, that when a Dutchman's horse does not go as he would have him, he calls him, in great rage, an *Arminian!*

For the Arminianism of Geneva, see above p. 250.

aid of divine grace, and other fundamental doctrines of Christianity, appear to have fallen far below the standard of the Gospel. So comprehensive is it said to have become, that Christians of all sects and denominations, whatever their sentiments and opinions may be, Papists excepted, may be formed, according to it, into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord. Many who do not belong to the Church of England, and not a few of those who are within her pale, both Clergy and Laity, seem to believe, and warmly contend, on the other hand, that her doctrinal articles and confessional, are strictly Calvinistic! and on this subject, the dispute perhaps never ran higher than it has done of late years.[1]

The members of the *Episcopal Church in Scotland*—the *Moravians*—the *General Baptists*—the *Wesleian Methodists*—the *Quakers*, &c. are Arminians; and it is generally supposed that a great proportion of the Clergy of the Kirk of Scotland teach the Arminian doctrines, although their Confession of Faith is strictly Calvinistic.

Some of the other eminent men and writers among the Arminians, besides those already mentioned, are Vorstius, Grotius, Le Clerk, Cattenburgh, Brandt, Wetstein, Laud, J. Goodwin, and Taylor, not to mention many others of more modern date, as Tillotson, Warburton, Law, &c. &c.

[1] See the art. *United Church of England and Ireland*, below.

"It is certain," says Dr M'Laine, "that the most eminent philosophers have been found, generally speaking, among the Arminians. If both Calvinists and Arminians claim a *King*, it is certain that the latter alone can boast of a *Newton*, a *Locke*, a *Clarke*, and a *Boyle*." [1]

The great Archbishop Usher is said to have lived a Calvinist, and died an Arminian. Dr Whitby also, the celebrated commentator, who was originally a Calvinist, has written a large and elaborate defence of Arminianism; and the reader should consult Dr Taylor's (of Norwich,) *Key to the Epistle to the Romans*, which has been much admired on this subject, though, in other respects, it is by no means without its faults. Nor ought Mr Wesley to be forgotten here, whose labours are well known, and who was a zealous advocate for the tenets of Arminius; see in particular his *Arminian Magazine*.

Some of the principal writers on the other side have been—Dr Owen in his *Display of Arminianism* and on *Particular Redemption*;—Dr Gill in his *Cause of God and Truth*;—Dr Edwards *On the Will*, and on *Original Sin*;—Pol-

[1] Note (ee) to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 464, 5.

An accurate account of the foreign Arminian writers is given by Adrian Van Cattenburgh, in his *Bibl. Scriptorum Remonstrantium*, 8vo. Amstel. 1728; and for some account of their Confessions of Faith, and the historical writers, who have treated of this sect, vide Jo. Christ. Koecheri *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 481.

whele in his book *On the Decrees*;—John Edwards in his *Veritas Redux*;—Cole in his *Sovereignty of God*;—and *Toplady* in almost all his works.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.—The points in dispute between the Arminians and Calvinists have seldom failed to be more or less warmly contested, from the beginning of the 17th century to the present day; nor does the happy period seem yet to be near at hand, when divines shall no longer differ respecting them. Till then, conscious of the weakness of their own understandings, and sensible of the bias which the strongest minds are apt to receive from thinking long in the same tract, they ought to differ with charity and meekness, and to pay due regard to the favourite precept of their Lord and Master.

The sacred cause of truth can never be promoted by angry controversy or railing accusation. It should be vindicated, not only by sound and temperate discussion, but also and *especially*, by the manifestation of its sanctifying and transforming power over the life and conversation; and by evincing, that the like "mind is in us which was in Christ Jesus our Lord."

ANTINOMIANISM,

AND

ANTINOMIANS.

NAMES.—The Antinomians derive their name from two Greek words, ἀντι, signifying, *against*, and νομος, a *law*; their favourite tenet being, that the law is not a rule of life to believers under the Gospel. But it is not easy to ascertain what they mean by this position, and indeed their very name is ambiguous; it is not so descriptive and confined as *Quaker*, but rather more vague, like *lawless*.

They are also sometimes called *Solifidians*, a term compounded of two Latin words *solus*, *alone*, and *fides*, *faith*, because they seem to carry the doctrine of faith without works, to such lengths as to separate practical holiness from christian faith, and injure, if not wholly destroy, every obligation to moral obedience.

RISE, PROGRESS, HISTORY, &c.—The *Solifidian*, or *Antinomian* heresy, which asserts, that

nothing is required in man's salvation but faith in Christ, and which took its rise from a misunderstanding and perversion of some passages of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, was one of the first that disturbed the Christian Church, insomuch that St. Augustin says,[1] that not only the Epistle of St. James, but likewise those of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude, were written to guard the faithful against its pernicious influences.—And so many have been the heresies since the Apostolic age, in the composition of which this opinion has been a prime ingredient, that there perhaps has never yet been a time wherein the state of the Christian Church was such as not to require her ministers to urge the doctrine of St. James, that faith without works is dead, or to warn their people against turning the grace of God into lasciviousness.

Modern Antinomianism may be traced to the period of the Reformation. Its founder was *John Agricola*, a Saxon divine, a cotemporary, a countryman, and at first a disciple of Luther.—He was of a restless temper, and wrote against Melancthon; and having obtained a professorship at Wittemberg, he first taught Antinomianism there, about the year 1535. The Papists, in their disputes with the Protestants of that day, carried the merit of good works to an extravagant length; and this induced some of their opponents, as is too often the case, to run into the opposite ex-

[1] *De Fide et Operibus*, cap. 14.

treme. The doctrine of Agricola was in itself obscure, and perhaps represented worse than it really was by Luther, who wrote with acrimony against him, and first styled him and his followers *Antinomians*; perhaps thereby "intending," as Dr Hey conjectures, "to disgrace the notions of Agricola, and make even him ashamed of them."[1] Agricola stood in his own defence, and complained that opinions were imputed to him which he did not hold.

About the same time, *Nicholas Amsdorf*, Bishop of Nuremberg, fell under the same odious name and imputation, and seems to have been treated more unfairly than even Agricola himself.—The Bishop died at Magdeburg in 1541, and some say that his followers were called for a time after his name.

This sect sprung up among the Presbyterians in England, during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell,[2] when, as we have been told by Bishop Horne, "it was in all its glory," and extended its

[1] *Norrisian Lects.* vol. iii. p. 39. Even Luther himself was called an Antinomian, but that was against what is now the 11th article of the Church of England, whereas the Antinomians are so against the 7th article:—and hence two kinds of Antinomians, viz. 1. Those who reject the law of Moses:—and, 2dly, Those who have too high notions of the efficacy of faith.

[2] Dr Mosheim, who remarks that the judgment formed of the Antinomians by the other Presbyterian communities, is that they are—"a more rigid kind of Calvinists, who pervert Calvin's doctrine of absolute decrees to the worst purposes, by

system of libertinism much farther than Agricola did. Its doctrine seems to have been embraced in the last century also, by some of Mr Whitfield's preachers and others;[1] and if it be not yet so "rampant" as the Bishop feared it would be, it still prevails there to the present day, and is even said to be increasing, as well as in the principality of Wales.

DISTINGUISHING TENETS.—The supporters of the Popish doctrines deducing a considerable por-

drawing from it conclusions highly detrimental to the interests of true religion and virtue." *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 411.

There are doubtless many who still conceive Antinomianism to be nothing more than "*Calvinism run to seed;*" and that all Calvinists who rise above Calvin himself in their religious sentiments, particularly with respect to Election and Reprobation, are in danger of becoming Antinomians. But however this may be, there cannot be a doubt that no speculative sentiments ought to be carried to such a height as to endanger, even in appearance, the sacred interests of morality.

[1] "Not many years passed, before *Wm. Cudworth* and *James Relly* separated from Mr Whitfield. These were properly *Antinomians;* absolute avowed enemies to the law of God, which they never preached, or professed to preach, but termed all *Legalists* who did. With them, preaching the law was an abomination. They had nothing to do with the law. They would preach Christ, as they called it; but without one word either of holiness or good works. Yet these were still denominated *Methodists*, although differing from Mr Whitfield both in judgment and practice, abundantly more than Mr W. did from Mr Wesley." *Encycl. Britan.* vol. xi. p. 630. Art. *Methodists.*

tion of the arguments on which they rested their defence from the doctrines of the old law, Agricola, in the height of his zeal for reformation, was encouraged by the success of his master, Luther, to attack the very foundation of their arguments, and to deny that any part of the Old Testament was intended as a rule of faith or of practice to the disciples of Christ. Thus, he not only rejected the moral authority of even the ten commandments; but he and his followers, conceiving some of the expressions in the writings of the Apostles in too literal a sense, produced a system, which appears in many respects scarcely consistent with the moral attributes of the Deity; and he is said to have set aside the *law*, meaning thereby, the whole religion of Moses.

He is said to have taught—that the law ought not to be proposed to the people as a rule of manners, nor used in the Church as a means of instruction; and of course that repentance is not to be preached from the Decalogue, but only from the Gospel;—that the Gospel alone is to be inculcated and explained, both in the churches and the schools of learning; and that good works do not promote our salvation, nor evil works hinder it.

Some of his followers in England, in the 17th century, are said to have expressly maintained,—that as the elect cannot fall from grace, nor forfeit the divine favour, the wicked actions they commit are not really sinful, nor are they to be considered as instances of their violation of the

divine law, and that consequently they have no occasion either to confess their sins, or to break them off by repentance. According to them, it is one of the essential and distinctive characters of the elect, that they cannot do any thing displeasing to God, or prohibited by the law.[1]

That the justification of sinners is an immanent and eternal act of God, not only preceding all acts of sin, but the existence of the sinner himself, is the opinion of most of those, who are styled Antinomians, though some suppose, with Dr Crisp, that the elect were justified at the time of Christ's death.

The other principal doctrines which at present bear the appellation of Antinomian, are said to be as follow:—

1. That justification by faith is no more than a manifestation to us of what was done before we had a being.

2. That men ought not to doubt of their faith, or question whether they believe in Christ.

3. That by God's laying our iniquities upon Christ, and our being imputed righteous through him, he became as completely sinful as we, and we as completely righteous as Christ.

4. That believers need not fear either their own sins or the sins of others, since neither can do them any injury.

5. That the new covenant is not made properly with us, but with Christ for us; and that this

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 412.

covenant is all of it a promise, having no conditions for us to perform; for faith, repentance, and obedience, are not conditions on our part, but on Christ's; and that he repented, believed, and obeyed for us.

6. That sanctification is not a proper evidence of justification—that our righteousnes is nothing but the imputation of the righteousnes of Christ—that a believer has no holiness in himself but in Christ only; and that the very moment he is justified, he is wholly sanctified, and he is neither more nor less holy from that hour to the day of his death.

Justification by faith not necessarily productive of good works, and righteousness imputed to such a faith, are the doctrines by which they are chiefly distinguished.

While the Unitarians place the whole of their religion in morality to the disregard of Christian *faith*, the Antinomians rely so on faith as to undervalue *morality*.—Their doctrines at least have had that appearance; and it has been said, that their teachers have been thought to discharge the whole of their duty, if they inculcated the necessity of *faith*, and displayed the benefits of the *new* covenant. The manner in which they express themselves, may be seen in a review of *Dr Crisp's* Sermons by *Goree*.—It is scarce, but in *Sidney Col.* Library, Cambridge. *

* Justice to Dr Crisp requires it to be remarked here, that, objectionable as he doubtless is, he has disavowed the interpre-

Both the Mystics and Antinomians conceive themselves *free from sin*. The *Mystics* become free from sin by the intimate *union* of their souls with God and Jesus Christ; the *Antinomians*, by having all their sins *laid upon Jesus Christ*.—The Mystic enthusiast does not purposely do any thing which we should call wrong;—the Antinomian does things *wrong* in themselves, but they are *right*, because he, a true Christian, does them; insomuch that if he was *to steal*, the crime commonly called *theft*, would, in him, lose its criminal nature.

But I am not aware that any set of Christians ever *called themselves* Antinomians; it is a term of opprobrium or reproach; I would not therefore vouch for the truth of all that has been said respecting them by their enemies, but must observe here, and candour obliges us to confess, that there have been some, who have been styled Antinomians, who cannot, strictly speaking, be ranked among them; notwithstanding the unguarded expressions they have advanced, the bold positions they have laid down, and the double construction which might so easily be put upon many of their sentences, have led some to charge them with Antinomian principles. For instance; —when they have asserted justification to be eternal, without distinguishing between the secret determination of God in eternity, and the execu-

tation put upon his doctrines, in a Sermon on Titus ii. v. 11. 12., where he insists on the necessity of personal holiness.

tion of it in time;—when they have spoken lightly of good works, or asserted that believers have nothing to do with the law of God, without fully explaining what they mean;—when they assert that God is not angry with his people for their sins, nor in any sense punishes them for them, without distinguishing between fatherly corrections and vindictive punishment;—these expressions, whatever be the private sentiments of those who advance them, have a tendency to injure the minds, if not to hurt the morals, of others. It has indeed been alleged, that the principal thing they have had in view, was, to counteract those legal doctrines which have so much abounded among the self-righteous: but, granting this to be true, there is no occasion to run from one extreme to another. Had many of those writers proceeded with more caution, been less dogmatical, more explicit in the explanation of their sentiments, and possessed more candour towards those who differed from them, they would have been more serviceable to the cause of truth and religion.

NUMBERS, COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, WRITERS PRO AND CON., &c.—As those who assent to the above tenets still continue in the churches, or societies of Christians, to which they formerly belonged, (for I am not aware that they have any where formed themselves into a distinct sect,) it is difficult to ascertain either their numbers, or the countries where they are chiefly to be found.

In London, indeed, and a few other large towns in England, as Leicester, Nottingham, [1] &c., there are a few chapels, whose members, from their professing, or being supposed to profess, such tenets, are usually called *Antinomians*; and it is generally understood that Mr Huntington, [2] a popular preacher in London, is now at the head of the party in England and Wales.

It is said that there are many of them of a singular cast in Germany, and other parts of the continent; who condemn the moral law as a rule of life, and yet profess a strict regard for the interests of practical religion.

The fear of the bad tendency of Antinomianism among Christians occasioned its adherents to meet with severe checks from the friends of religion; their writings were condemned in 1643,

[1] In Leicester they had lately *four* chapels, and still have *three*; in Nottingham they have *two*.

[2] Minister of *Providence Chapel, Titchfield Street*. To do justice to the members of this denomination, (whose principles, I fear, are not yet well understood,) as well as to promote the object of my work, I took the liberty of addressing this gentleman by letter, intimating my intention of publishing on this subject, and requesting his assistance for this article, and that he would take the trouble of pointing out any erroneous ideas that the public might still entertain respecting any of their peculiar principles. As, therefore, most of my information on the subject of this article is from second hand, should I have here copied any of the mistakes of others, I shall sincerely regret it; at the same time I shall no doubt be considered the less blameable, that no notice was taken by Mr H. of my intimation and request.

by the Committee of the Westminster General Assembly, and they surely have never been so numerous in any country as might be expected from the doctrines they inculcate,[1] which are highly gratifying to the depraved wishes of proud and disobedient man.

Some of the chief of those who have been charged with favouring Antinomianism, since the time of Agricola, or at least whose works have had that tendency, are *Dr Crisp—Richardson—Saltmarsh—Hussey—Eaton—Town—Huntington*, &c.

A more full account of their tenets may be seen in Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 320, &c.—Clark's *Lives*, p. 142.—Ursinus' *Body of Divinity*, p. 620.—*Spiritual Magazine*, vol. ii. p. 171.—Dr Crisp's Sermons, entituled, *Christ alone exalted*, vol. i. p. 24, 29, 136, 143, 282, 298, 330; vol. ii. p. 144, 155.[2]—Saltmarsh on *Free Grace*, p. 92.—Eaton's *Honey Comb*, p. 446.—Town's

[1] We are told in Mr Nelson's *Life of Bishop Bull*, (p. 274, &c.) that they were reduced in England, in 1713, to three or four mean preachers, and chiefly by means of Bishop Bull and Dr D. Williams.

The Bishop's refutation of Antinomianism is to be found in his *Harmonia Apostolica*, and its *Defences*; and that of Dr. W. who was an eminent Presbyterian divine, and founder of the Dissenters Library in *Red Cross Street*, London, in his *Gospel Truth, stated and vindicated.*

[2] See most of the peculiar sentiments which appear to be taught in Dr C.'s Sermons, in Mr Fuller's edit. of Hannah Adams's *View of Religions*, under the art. *Antinomians.*

Assertions, p. 96.—*Display of God's Special Grace*, p. 102.[1]

Refutations of their writings have been written by *Luther*—*Rutherford*—*Sedgwick*—*Gataker*—*Witsius*—*Fleury*—*Bishop Bull*—*Dr D. Williams*—*Ridgley*—*Beart*, &c. To which may be added, the late Rev. and pious *Mr Fletcher*, Vicar of Madeley, in Shropshire, in his *Four Checks to Antinomianism*, which have been much read and greatly admired, though not perhaps wholly unexceptionable:—*Bellamy* in his *Letters and Dialogues between Theron, Paulinus, and Aspasio*, and in his *Essay on the Nature and Glory of the Gospel*; and *Edwards* in his work on *Religious Affections*, though not written in a controversial style.

Miscellaneous Remarks.—As far as the members of this denomination separate personal holiness from Christian faith, and fail to view the Gospel as exhibiting a system of doctrine "*according to Godliness*," so far do they differ from

[1] Mosheim refers us for an account of the tenets of the *Antinomians*, and of the modern disputes that were occasioned by the publication of the Posthumous Works of Dr Crisp, to a work entitled *Examen des Defauts Theologiques*, (tom. 2. p. 198,) which he attributes, (but, according to Dr M'Laine, erroneously,) to Dr Courayer.

Wigandus wrote a comparison between Ancient and Modern Antinomians.—See also Sagittarii *Introd. in Hist. Eccles.* cap. 33, sect. 7.

almost every other sect and denomination of professing Christians; and however mighty they may be in the Scriptures, or eloquent in their own defence, yet do they doubtless stand in need of an Aquila and Priscilla, to expound unto them the way of God, and the faith of the Gospel "*more perfectly.*"

Nor is it sufficient for Dr Crisp's biographer to tell us, "that his life was so innocent and free from all evil, so zealous and fervent in all good, that it seemed to be designed as a practical confutation of the slander of those who would insinuate that his doctrine tended to licentiousness;" for, granting all this to be true, yet it is possible for one's disposition, and the circumstances in which he is placed, to counteract the ill tendency of his principles. Spinoza, the noted Atheist, is said to have been of an obliging disposition, and very regular in his morals and conduct; and the same may be said of Lord Herbert, Mr Hume, and others, who, notwithstanding their principles were highly exceptionable, exhibited in their general conduct the most regular and inoffensive examples.

From comparing the avowed principles of these men with their practice, charity would lead us to conclude, that they estimated the influence of their tenets upon the conduct of others, according to the effect that they produced upon their own. But calm reflection must convince us, that this standard is false and delusive; and that from the inefficacy of certain principles to corrupt some

minds, we cannot pronounce concerning their general tendency and effects, without violating every principle of reason and philosophy.

There was a time when *faith* and a *good life* were synonimous terms, or when no one was accounted a *believer* who was not a *practical christian;* and though the opinions of men may change, and heresies be found to "make their periodical revolutions in the Church," like comets in the heavens, "nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure;"—with the faith of the Gospel, as with the Father of lights, there is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning," and that only is true and saving faith, "which makes us to love God—*to do his will*—to suffer his impositions—to trust his promises—to see through a cloud—*to overcome the world*—*to resist the devil*—to stand in the day of trial, and to be comforted in all our sorrows."[1]

[1] Bishop Taylor's Sermon, entitled, *Fides Formata,* in his Sermons, fol. p. 43.

EPISCOPACY,

AND

EPISCOPALIANS.

NAMES.—The terms Episcopacy and Episcopalians are derived from the Greek word Επισκοπος, which signifies a Bishop. Episcopalians, in the strict sense of the word, are those who maintain, that Episcopacy is of Apostolical institution, or that the Church of Christ has ever been governed by three *distinct* orders, Bishops, Presbyters or Priests, and Deacons;—that no one has a right to execute the ministerial office, without having previously received a divine commission;—and, that the exclusive right of granting this commission is vested in the Bishops, as successors of the Apostles.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—The Presbyterians contend, that the primitive Church acknowledged only two orders, and therefore maintain the identity of Bishops and Presbyters. On the other

hand, the Episcopalians insist, that it is very clear from ecclesiastical antiquity, that the hierarchy of the ancient Church consisted of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and consequently that Bishops are to be distinguished from Presbyters.

In evidence of this, they produce the testimonies of many of the Fathers, as Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian, St Cyprian, &c.

St. Jerom, who will be allowed to speak the sense of the ancients, calls Presbyters *Priests of the inferior degree*, and Deacons the *third degree*; and the testimony of St Ignatius in particular is full and evident.—In his Epistle to the Magnesians, he exhorts them "to do all things in unity, under the Bishop, presiding in the place of God, the Presbyters in the place of the Apostolical Senate, and the Deacons, to whom is committed the ministry and service of Jesus Christ."—In his Epistle to the Smyrneans, he calls upon them all "to obey their Bishop, even as Christ obeys the Father; to venerate the Presbyters as the Apostles; and the Deacons as the commandments of God:"—and his repeated exhortations in *all* his Epistles sufficiently prove, that in his days, that is to say, during the life of the Apostle St John, there were three distinct orders in the Church.

He constantly and accurately distinguishes these orders from each other; and he uses such language respecting Episcopal authority, as it is highly improbable that he, or any rational being, would have adopted, had it not been well known,

and universally acknowledged, that the order of Bishops was of Apostolical institution.'

That this order, in the sense contended for by Episcopalians, was actually existing, and generally established, as early as the year 160. P. C. is a fact which was never denied by any candid adversary of primitive Episcopacy; not even by Blondel, Molinæus, nor Beza. See in the 3d chap. of Sage's *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, &c. a large collection of the most celebrated Presbyterian writers acknowledging that Episcopacy prevailed in the Church in St. Cyprian's time. And what account can be given of this fact, but continuance, and not usurpation? How can it be accounted for, but by supposing that it had existed from the beginning? The mere continuance of an old establishment may easily fail of being directly noticed in the records of the times; but the

[1] That these Epistles are genuine has been fully proved by Isaac Vossius, (a Presbyterian,) Archbishop Usher, Bishop Pearson, Du Pin, &c. See Bishop Pearson's *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, and Bishop Horsley's *Tracts*, p. 120.

Even Mosheim, who was no great friend to Episcopacy, says of these Epistles, "Nulla forte lis plerisque Ignatianarum Epistolarum mota fuisset, nisi qui pro divino origine et antiquitate gubernationis Episcopalis pugnant, causam suam ex his fulcire potuissent."—*De Rebus Christian. ante Constant.* p. 160.

So meanly did Le Clerk think of De la Roque's answer to Bishop Pearson's Vindication of St Ignatius's Epistles, that he would not reprint it along with the works of some eminent moderns, relating to the subject of the Apostolical Fathers, subjoined to his edition of those fathers.

commencement of a new one could not be overlooked.

"When I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies, then will I begin to believe that Presbyterian government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles' times, should presently after, against the Apostles' doctrine and will of Christ, be whirled about like a stone in a masque, and be transformed into Episcopacy."[1]

The question between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians is not, what degree of power and splendour the primitive Bishops enjoyed, or what might be the precise extent of their dioceses? but simply and solely, whether they were the same as the Presbyters, or whether they were a distinct order?

The Episcopalians contend for this last opinion; and, insisting that the Episcopal form of Church Government was not only primitive and Apostolical, but also *universal*,[2] they challenge their antagonists to produce, from all the records of antiquity, a single instance of a presbyteral

[1] *Chillingworth.* See in his works, his *Apostol. Institution of Episcopacy demonstrated*, which is comprised in four pages.

[2] "Truly this" (the Episcopal) "form of government, all churches every where received;" *i. e.* "presently after the Apostles' times, or even in their time, as ecclesiastical history witnesseth." So says *Petrus Molinæus*, in a book purposely written in defence of the *Presbyterian* Government.

community, previous to that established by Calvin at Geneva. [1]

When the name of Patriarch first arose in the Church has not been fully ascertained; it is, however, certain, that it was well known in the 4th century, and the patriarchal power was not one and the same precisely in all churches, but differed according to the different customs of places and countries, or the pleasure of kings and councils. Patriarch was originally of the same import with Archbishop, which last was first used about the same time, and was anciently a more extensive title than now, being seldom given to any

[1] Hooker challenges the sectaries of his time, "to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by their discipline, or that hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal regiment sithence the time of the blessed Apostles were here conversant."—*Pref.* to *Eccl. Pol.* p. 10. Edit. 1666.

See also Lowth's *Directions for Reading the Scriptures*, chap. 3.

Yet Dr M'Laine, the learned translator of Mosheim, who admits that Episcopacy "appears to be the most conformable to the practice of the Church, since Christianity became the established religion of the Roman Empire," says, that "the situation of the primitive Church (oppressed by continual persecutions, and obliged by their sufferings to be contented with a form of government extremely simple, and with a parity of rank *for want of ambition to propose*, or *power to support* a subordination) *suggested*, without doubt, the idea of this latter system," *i. e.* Presbyterianism; and that Calvin "*restored* this Presbyterian or republican form of ecclesiastical polity." Note (k) to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 126. Edit. 1806.

but those whose jurisdiction extended over a whole Imperial diocese, as the Bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, &c.—The former term is now used only in the Greek and Eastern Churches; and in the West, the jurisdiction of Archbishops is confined to a single province, in which they have several Suffragan Bishops under them.

These new titles were given, or assumed, soon after Christianity became the religion of the State, and was established by human laws. It then began to assume a new form;—eminence in the Church was no longer the road to more severe persecution, but became an object of ambition;—dioceses were extended;—princes interfered in the nomination and appointment of Bishops;—and, in process of time, the Bishop of Rome rose superior to all other Bishops, and ruled, with a rod of iron, the whole Christian World.

To this usurped authority of the see of Rome, opposition had often been made before the æra of the Reformation, when it received a powerful check from Luther and his followers. And it was then, or soon after, that a change of government first took place in any part of the Church; for while some reformers were careful to reject nothing but what was wrong, others, in their zeal for reformation, overstept the mark, and, together with those errors which had crept into the Church in the dark ages of Popery, laid aside the office and order of Bishops as a corruption, and not from necessity, as some have pretended; for it has been fully proved by Episcopalians, that such

necessity never existed in fact.[1] At the head of these over-zealous reformers stands Calvin, who, notwithstanding, professes to admire the constitution of the Church of England, and to lament the necessity he was under of breaking the Apostolical succession. But however this may be, it is certain, that neither he nor his followers have ever sought to recover that primitive form of Church Government which he acknowledged and seemed to prefer.[2]

[1] See Mr Skinner's *Eccles. Hist. of Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 129, &c. where an account is given of no fewer than *ten* Bishops, who, in the beginning of the Reformation, renounced the communion of the Church of Rome, and could have been the means of preserving the Episcopal order in any Protestant society that chose to accept of it.

An able Episcopalian observes, that Calvin, Beza, and their followers, could not at first "lie under the imputation of throwing off the primitive Episcopacy, which had continued without interruption through the whole Christian world, from the days of the Apostles down to their time. Therefore they *justified* it in the highest terms, and pleaded only *necessity* for their not having it, which they called their great *misfortune*. But afterwards they found a *greater necessity*, which may be at first they thought not of, which was, to *eat* their own words, to *stifle* them as much as they could, and carry on the *war* against *Episcopacy* itself. Thus Hazael said to the prophet, 'Is thy servant a dog, that I should do such things?"—Preface to Mr Leslie's *Rehearsals*.

[2] See his *Answer to Mr Cartwright's representation of his opinion of Archbishops and Bishops*.—See also his *Inst.* lib. iv. c. 4, s. 1. 2. passim.

Yet many of Calvin's followers have displayed no little zeal against Episcopacy and Episcopalians; but may not the latter

In England, and the Northern Kingdoms, and partly in Germany,[1] the ancient Episcopal form of Church Government was still continued after the Reformation,[1] under certain limitations. But in Switzerland, and the Low Countries, where a Republican policy was adopted in the State, all pre-eminence of order in the Church also was destroyed, and that form of ecclesiastical government established, which has been since called *Presbyterianism.*

See Slater's *Original Draught of the Primitive Church;*—Bishop Sage's *Principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to Episcopal power and jurisdiction;*—Dr Maurice's *Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy;* —Dr Cave's *Government of the ancient Church;* —Archbishop Usher's *Opuscula duo de Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum origine;*—and Calder's *Priesthood of the Old and New Testament by succession.*

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINE.—The distinguishing tenet of the members of this denomination is, that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are three distinct subordinate callings in the Church, and that the Bishops have a superiority over the other two orders, *jure divino:* or, in other words, that all ecclesiastical ministers, superior to the rank of Deacons, are not co-ordinate and

address all such in the words of Isaiah, "Look into the rock from whence ye are hewn," &c.?

[1] See the Church Government of the German Lutherans below.

equal, but that there hath ever existed a third and higher class, (by whatever name the members of it may have been distinguished,) to which both the others have all along been indebted for their authority, and responsible for their conduct.

They and the Presbyterians are fully agreed in this—that no man can lawfully arrogate to himself the office of a minister of the Gospel, but that he must receive his authority from those that have power to grant it; so that here they are jointly at issue with all self-constituted teachers. But they widely differ between themselves in this further position, which is strenuously maintained by Episcopalians,—that such power does not belong to Presbyters, but is vested in the hands of Bishops.

In proof of their doctrine, the friends of Episcopacy think that there is complete scriptural evidence of the Apostolical institution of Episcopacy, in the presidency of St. James over the Presbyters of Jerusalem;—in the presidency of Timothy and Titus over the Presbyters of Ephesus and Crete; and in the authority which the Seven Angels unquestionably possessed over all the Presbyters of Asia Minor. They allege, that during our Saviour's stay upon earth, he had under him two distinct orders of ministers—the twelve and the seventy; and after his ascension, immediately before which he had enlarged the powers of the eleven, we read of Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons in the Church:—and, that the Apostolic, or highest order, was designed to be

permanent in the Bishops, is evident from Bishops being instituted by the Apostles themselves, to succeed them in great cities, as Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete, &c. It appears that Timothy and Titus were superior to modern Presbyters, from the offices assigned them. Thus, Timothy was empowered by St. Paul, to preside over the Presbyters at Ephesus, to receive accusations against them, to exhort, to charge, and even to rebuke them; and Titus was, by the same Apostle, left at Crete for the express purpose of setting things in order, and ordaining Presbyters in *every* city. It is said in I. Timothy, 5. v. 19. "Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses."—Therefore, say they, Timothy was a judge, Presbyters were brought before him, and he was superior to them.

Thus should it not be admitted, that there is a positive institution in Scripture of the Episcopal form of Church Government; yet Episcopalians insist, that they have primitive and even Apostolical practice for their precedent, which they think equivalent to an institution.

Accordingly, the more strict Episcopalians maintain, that if it be not expressed, it is at least implied, in Scripture, that the Episcopal form of Church Government should be exclusively adhered to in all ages and nations. And from their doctrine, it follows, that ordination is not valid when conveyed by a College of Presbyters without a Bishop; and that the Sacraments administered by persons

who have received this defective ordination, do not fulfil the purposes for which they were instituted.[1] Others again, as Bishops Stillingfleet and Pretyman, Mr Gisborne, &c. admit a greater latitude of opinion, and conceive, that the Scriptures do not prescribe or enjoin any definite form of Church Government;—that though the Apostles themselves adopted, in their practice, the Episcopal form, yet they left no command which rendered Episcopacy universally indispensible in future times, if other forms should evidently promise, through local opinions and circumstances, greater benefit to religion:—Or, that "as it hath not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures; so neither has he prescribed any particular form of Ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness."[2]

"Such," says Mr Gisborne, alluding to this last, "such is the general sentiment of the present Church of England on this subject."—Perhaps the opinion on this head of her governors and members in general, cannot be better expressed than in the language of the *Anti-Jac. Reviewers*;—"On the authority of those Clergymen who officiate in Churches that have *rejected* the

[1] See in the *Scholar Armed, a Discourse on the qualifications requisite to administer the Sacraments*, by Mr C. Leslie.

[2] Bishop Pretyman's *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. ii. p. 398.—and Mr Gisborne's *Survey*, p. 497.

Episcopal order and succession, it belongs not to us to pass any judgment. Whilst we feel it to be our duty to 'ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein, that we may find rest for our souls,' we shall leave those who have traced out for themselves new paths, to the judgment of the supreme Bishop of souls, who, as he knows our frailties, will make every possible allowance for unavoidable ignorance, and even for incorrigible ignorance." [1]

As to the form of Government which has long been adopted in the Church of Rome;—the doctrine of the Pope's being the only source of ecclesiastical power, and universal Bishop over all the Bishops and Churches in the world, (although the members of that Church pretend to have derived it all the way down from St. Peter,) was unknown in the primitive Church, and may be considered as a kind of excrescence which grew up on the body of Episcopacy in the 7th century. [2]

[1] Vol. ix. p. 241.

[2] The first that assumed the title of *Universal Bishop*, was John, Patriarch of Constantinople; against whom Gregory I. surnamed the *Great*, wrote with much spirit, and said that none of his own predecessors, Bishops of Rome, did ever assume such an arrogant title, which he also calls *blasphemous*, and said that whoever did arrogate it to himself was a *Lucifer* for pride, and the *fore-runner* of Anti-Christ. Yet Pope Boniface III. next successor but one to Gregory I. took this very title, given him by the tyrant Phocas in 606.—The progress of this usurpation of the Popes, and the struggle of the Bishops against it, may be

A brief statement of the four different opinions respecting Church Government, whereof Episcopacy is one, may be found in Mr Gisborne's *Familiar Survey of the Christian Religion.*[1]

Most Episcopalians are Athanasians, or at least hold the substance of the doctrine contained in the *Athanasian Creed:* all of them are Trinitarians, and they all use a liturgy in their public worship.

Most Episcopalians I believe are, at this day, Anti-Calvinists; yet Calvinism is by no means incompatible with Episcopacy, Calvin himself being judge; and some of the ablest and most pious divines of the Church of England have doubtless been doctrinal Calvinists.

For further information on the subject of this article in general, see Hooker's *Eccles. Polity;*—Archbishop Potter *on Church Government;*—Parker's *Government of the Church for the first* 600 *years;*—and Bishop Burnet *on the thirty-nine Articles.*

NUMBERS, AUTHORS, AND WORKS ON THE EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY.—Almost all professing Christians may be considered as Episcopa-

traced in many instances, even at the council of *Trent;* and afterwards a very strong opposition was made to it in 1682, by the whole body of the Bishops and Clergy of France.

See their decrees on this subject, in the Appendix to *The Case of the Regale and Pontificate*, p. 270. Edit. 1701.

[1] P. 496. 7. or above, vol. i. p. 203. 4.

lians, except the Presbyterians and Independents; and a catalogue of all the Archbishoprics and Bishoprics of the Western Church may be seen in Wells's *Treatise of Ancient and Modern Geography.*[1] In addition to the works already referred to, the following deserve to be mentioned—Bilson's *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church;*—Dr Hickes's *Divine Right of Episcopacy;*—Dr Brett's *Divine Right of Episcopacy;*—Bishop Hall's *Episcopacy by Divine Right;*—Bishop Taylor's *Defence of Episcopacy;*—together with the very able critique on the late Dr Campbell's *Lectures* in the *Anti-Jacobin Review.*

Those who wish to know what has been said on the other side of the question, may consult Beza *De Triplici Episcopatu;*—Blondel's *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi;*—Baxter's *Church History of Bishops;*—Neale's *History of the Puritans;*—Clarkson *on Episcopacy;*—or Lord Chancellor King's *Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, &c. of the Primitive Church.* In answer to this last, an *Original Draught of the Primitive Church* was written, which is a work of such merit, that it is said to have converted Lord King himself, who certainly preferred its author, Mr Slater, in the Church.[2]

[1] P. 157, &c. The succession of Bishops in the ancient great Bishoprics may be seen in Eusebius, in Dr Cave's *Lives of the Fathers,* or in Dr Pagitt's *Christianography.*

[2] Another answer to it may be found in Bishop Smalridge's *Sermons,* fol. p. 107,—112.

PRESBYTERIANISM,

AND

PRESBYTERIANS.

NAME.—The term *Presbyterian* comes from the Greek word Πρεσβύτερος, which signifies *Senior* or *Elder;* and the Presbyterians are so called from their maintaining that the Government of the Church appointed in the New Testament was by Presbyteries, *i. e.* by associations of ministers and ruling elders, all possessed of equal powers, without any superiority among them, either in office or in order.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—Although the Presbyterians in general insist, that the Church was originally constituted according to their principles, yet their opponents as firmly believe that it is in vain to look for the origin of their scheme of Church Government till after the Reformation.—Even Dr Hill, who traces the origin of Presbyte-

rianism to the practice of the Apostles, and affirms that there are no traces of Episcopacy in Scripture, or in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, admits that this last form prevailed almost universally in the 2d century; and also that from that time to the æra of the Reformation the order of Bishops, as distinct from, and superior to, Presbyters, "continued to exist almost in all parts of the Christian world, and was regarded with respect and submission, both by the clergy and the laity."[1] He then adds, that "the first reformers, who believed that the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters has no foundation in Scripture, and who wished to apply an effectual remedy to the abuses which appeared to them to have arisen, in the progress of human ambition from the practice of investing Bishops with powers superior to Presbyters, did not consider the antiquity or universality of that practice as any reason for its being continued. Recurring to what they accounted the primitive Scripture model, they laid the foundation of Presbyterian Church Government in this principle, that all ministers are equal in rank and power; and they did not admit any official preference but that which is

[1] *Theological Institutes*, p. 167. Dr Campbell also admits that, about the middle of the second century, a kind of Episcopacy had grown out of the original institution of perpetual Moderators. *Lect.* on *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i.

See above p. 277.

constituted by voluntary agreement for the sake of order."

The reformers here alluded to were chiefly Calvin, who may be said to be the founder of Presbytery, having first established that form at Geneva about 1541,[1] and Messrs John Knox and Andrew Melvil, who soon after introduced it into Scotland; where, from the first dawn of reformation till the revolution, there was a perpetual struggle of contending parties, whether their Church should be modelled according to the Episcopal or the Presbyterian form of Church Government. These men, together with Beza and some others, were violent reformers, and seem to have laid it down as a principle, that in new modelling their respective Churches, they could not recede too far from the Church of Rome, and hence they condemned Episcopacy as having no foundation in the word of God.[2]

[1] Some indeed tell us, that this platform of Church Government was first set up at Geneva, by Calvin's predecessors *Farel* and *Viret*, and afterwards adopted by him.

[2] If Calvin himself, as well as most of his followers, rejected Episcopacy, on *this ground* as, I believe, he is generally understood to have done, (see also Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 392,) he can scarcely be allowed the praise of consistency, for he taught that "there is a *threefold ministry commended unto us in Scripture*, and whatever ministry was in the primitive Church, was distinguished into *three orders*; for, from the order of Presbyters, there was chosen pastors and doctors, the rest were to inspect manners and censures.—The care of the poor was committed to the Deacons.—St. Hierom names *five orders* in the Church, viz. Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, the

From Geneva Presbyterianism was introduced among the reformed in France, and into Holland, as well as into England and Scotland, in which last country it became the established form of Church Government at the Revolution in 1688.

The first Presbytery in England was set up at Wandsworth, in Surrey, in 1572,[1] some years before a Presbytery was heard of in Scotland; which first establishment was called *the Order of Wandsworth* by Field their minister: and under Cromwell, who was alike averse to Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, though he found it expedient to shew favour to the latter, the Church of England was delivered to the management of a set of commissioners, consisting partly of Presbyterians, and partly of Independents. But upon the restoration of Charles II. the Church resumed its ancient form of Episcopal Government; and upwards of 2000 of the clergy attached to Presbyterian discipline, relinquished their cures in consequence of the *Act of Uniformity*, which took place on St. Bartholomew's day 1662, by which, says Dr M'Laine, "the validity of Pres-

Fideles or Faithful, and the Catechumeni, (*three* of these were of the Clergy, the other two of the Laity.")—*Calv. Inst.* lib. iv. c. 4. s. 1.

[1] Hence Fuller calls it the *first-born* of all Presbyteries in England. Cent. 16. p. 103.

byterian ordination was renounced, and the ministrations of the foreign churches disowned."[1]

During the troubles of the 17th century, many English Presbyterians emigrated, together with multitudes of other denominations, to America, where they have been increasing to the present day, when the Presbyterians make a great proportion of the inhabitants of the United States.

See Lord Chancellor King's *Enquiry* referred to above p. 288; together with *A Letter from a Parochial Bishop to a Prelatical Gentleman*, and *An Apology for the Church of Scotland*, works of considerable learning and ingenuity, and both said to have been written by Mr Willison, sometime minister in Dundee.

The impartial lover of truth will do well to consult also Mr Slater's Answer to Lord King's work, entitled, an *Original Draught of the Primitive Church*, and *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as it hath lately been established in the*

[1] Many of those men, however, had received Episcopal ordination; but it seems they preferred taking their lot among the Dissenters to a compliance with the terms of this Act, which required all ministers, who would continue in the Church, or be admitted to livings, to use the same form of worship, to subscribe the 39 Articles, and declare their assent and consent to a new edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Many of them were eminent for piety and learning, and not a few of them had neither any private fortune, nor any prospects out of the Church; they must therefore be allowed the credit of a sincerity and disinterestedness which deserved consideration.

Kingdom of Scotland, * 8vo. London 1695, or edit. 1697.

DISTINGUISHING TENETS AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT.—The members of Presbyteral Communities hold the divine authority of the priesthood equally with Episcopalians; but they differ from them in their mode of ecclesiastical government, and in their manner of conferring the powers of the ministry. They believe that the authority of their ministers to preach the Gospel, to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and to feed the flock of Christ, is derived from the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the hands of the *Presbytery;* and they oppose the independent scheme of the common rights of Christians by the same arguments which are used for that purpose by the Episcopalians. They affirm, however, that there is no order in the Church as established by Christ and his Apostles, superior to that of Presbyters;—that all ministers, being ambassadors of Christ, are equal by their commission;—that *Presbyter* and *Bishop,* though different words, are of the same import;—and that Episcopacy was gradually established upon the primitive practice of making the *Moderator* or

* "This anonymous work is known to have been written by the learned Dr Sage, and it deserves to be read with attention by every Scotchman." *Brit. Critic* for Feb. 1805.

For a more full account of the history of Presbyterianism in Scotland, see the article *Church of Scotland,* below.

Speaker of the Presbytery a permanent officer.

For the arguments which they use in maintaining these positions against the Episcopalians, see the article *Presbyterians* in the *Encyclop. Britan.*

There have been, and still are, warm advocates for the divine right of Presbytery, as well as for that of Episcopacy; and those, or most of those, that hold the former, contend, that the Presbyterian form of government is delineated and prescribed in Scripture, as a rule to which all the members of the Church of Christ are bound to submit till the end of the world, and consequently that every other form is unlawful.[1] It was a conviction of this doctrine that produced, during the commotions of the 17th century, the "*Solemn League and Covenant*," which was subscribed by many of all ranks in England and Scotland, who swore, with their hands lifted up to the Most High God, that they would endeavour the extirpation of Prelacy, *i. e.* of Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy: and when the Presbyterians attained supreme power, they are said to have fulfilled this oath by many unjust and violent deeds.[2]

[1] See in particular the London Ministers *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, 4to. London, 1647. 2d edit.

[2] "The Presbyterians called toleration an hideous monster; the great Diana of the Independents; and had no wish to encourage it. In the treaty of the Isle of Wight, they refused to allow to Charles the use of the Common Prayer Book in his own family. In a state of subjection, they pleaded for tolera-

On the other hand, many Presbyterians, as well as some Episcopalians, vindicate their own mode of Church Government, as a good human device, upon the principle that the particular form has been left by Christ, to be particularly moulded by the rulers of the Church and State, agreeably to the prejudices, prepossessions, and customs of different countries.

The established Church of Scotland exhibits the best model of Presbyterian Church Government now existing; and to this head, under the article *Church of Scotland*, the reader is referred.

In some of the Churches on the Continent, where a number of Presbyters have the charge of a city or district, there are *Superintendents*, Præpositi, or Inspectores, who are appointed for life to preside in the Council of Presbyters; but who, having no other superiority than that which is implied in the office of president, and no powers or privileges essentially different from those which belong to Presbyters, are only accounted *primi inter pares*;—a form of government which seems to extend also to the German Lutherans. But in the greater part of Presbyterian Churches, from a jealousy, lest, under the form of Superintendency, some kind of Prelacy might be introduced, the parity of ministers is guarded by the frequent election of a new President or Moderator, who, when his term is expired, returns to an

tion, as all dependent sects do, but forgot it when in power."—Gray's *Bamp. Lect.* p. 284. Note.

equality with his brethren. A body of Presbyters, having a Moderator, who conducts the proceedings, and executes the sentences, is considered as competent to perform all the acts, which, in Episcopal Government, belong exclusively to the Bishop. It tries the qualifications of candidates for the office of the ministry;—it confers orders by the imposition of hands;—to those who are nominated by persons having right of nomination, it grants the investiture of the sacred office, or induction into the charge of a particular parish; and it exercises inspection and jurisdiction over the pastors of all the parishes within its bounds.[1]

Almost all Presbyterians are Calvinists, (the Arminians in Holland, &c. excepted,) at least their public standards of faith are Calvinistical; viz.—The *Belgic Confession*;—The *Articles of the Synod of Dort*;—The *Westminster Confession of Faith*; together with the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*, &c.; but very few of the Presbyterians in England are said to be Calvinists at present, and many of those also in the Church of Scotland are supposed to have departed from the peculiar doctrines of their standards. It may also be remarked here, that though many *Unitarians*

[1] Dr Hill, p. 169, 170. See also p. 166, where the Dr tells us, that Presbyterians hold that "every person who is ordained, is as much a successor of the Apostles as any Christian teacher can be." The learned Dr elsewhere contends, that Church Government is of divine appointment, and that the right of performing every ordinary ecclesiastical function was conveyed by the Apostles to *all* whom they ordained.

are nominally Presbyterians in regard to Church Government, yet none of them are Calvinists, nor do they admit the Presbyterian standards of faith.

The Presbyterians, Independents, and others who embrace those standards, as well as the Roman Catholics, profess to believe that there is no salvation out of the Church of Christ. "Out of the visible Church, which is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." [1]

Again, "They who, having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the law of that religion which they profess," &c. [2]

The general system of Presbyterian doctrine and government may be found in Walonis Messalini *De Episcopis et Presbyteris*, 12mo. Lugd. Batav. 1641; [3]—*Piercii Vindiciæ Fratrum Dissentientium in Anglia*, which may also be had in English in 8vo. 1717;—*A Petition for Peace with the Reformation of the Liturgy, as it was present-*

[1] *Confession of Faith*, chap. 25.

[2] *Larger Catechism*, answer to Quest. 60.

[3] On the copy of this work now before me, I find this MS. note "Verum nomen Autoris fuit *Claudius Salmasius*, qui scripsit etiam *De Primatu Papæ*. Hoc tamen dissimulans, nonnunquam loquitur de Salmasio in tertia persona, ut p. 164, 165, 176, 177," &c. So also S. W. Sluterus, in his *Prophylæum Hist. Christianæ*, p. 144.

ed to the Bishops by the (Dissenting) Divines, &c. 4to. 1661; and in Towgood's *Letter to White*, of which the last edition was published in 1787.—See also *The Form of Presbyterial Church Government*, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines of Westminster, and of equal authority with the *Confession of Faith*.

WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.—Calvin was himself no enemy to Liturgies, but "highly approved of them, and composed certain forms of prayer, to be used by the ministers in Geneva in the public worship, on Sundays and other holidays, and at the administration of the Sacraments;"[1] but almost all Presbyterians, at least in Britain, Ireland, and America, have now laid them aside, and use extemporary prayer in the worship of God.[2] They also differ from Episco-

[1] See Calvin, in Matth. vi. v. 9. and chap. xviii. v. 19. 20. Inst. lib. iii. c. 20. s. 32.; lib. iv. c. 1. s. 23 and 31. Epist. ad Protect. *Opusc.* p. 83.

[2] "The Presbyterian mode of worship," says Dr Eveleigh, in his *Bamp. Lect.* p. 170, "seems to have been taken from the alternative permitted under Knox's, or the old, Liturgy in Scotland; to which it is subjoined:—'It shall not be necessary for the ministers daily to repeat all these things before mentioned; but beginning with some manner of confession to proceed to the Sermon: which ended, he either useth the prayer for all estates, or else prayeth as the spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and manner which he hath entreated of."—Collier's *Hist.* vol. ii. p. 561.

Some of the fruits of this unhappy alternative may be seen

palians in this, that while the latter kneel in time of prayer, the former stand, and in singing the praises of God they sit, while all Episcopalians stand; and, what will perhaps seem most remarkable, the Dutch Presbyterians are said to remain *covered* during public worship. These last have not, however, declared war against instrumental music in houses of public worship, like their brethren in Great Britain and Ireland.

Mosheim tells us, that Calvin laid a scheme for sending forth from his little republic of Geneva, "the succours and ministers that were to promote and propagate the Protestant cause through the most distant nations, and aimed at nothing less than rendering the government, discipline, and doctrine of Geneva, the model and rule of imitation to the reformed churches throughout the world."[1] So strict was the discipline that he established at Geneva, that it gave general offence; yet this may be said to be the ground work of that of Presbyterian Churches in general. For the Presbyterian discipline, the reader is again referred to the article Church of Scotland, which exhibits perhaps the best model existing at the present day, though now somewhat relaxed.

For his discharge of all the duties of the pastoral office, a minister is accountable only to the

in a work, entitled, *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed;* which, however, should be read and understood *cum grano salis.*

[1] Cent. 16. sect. 3. part 2.

Presbytery, from whom he received the charge of the parish.—" But in every thing which concerns what is called discipline, the exercise of that jurisdiction over the people with which the office-bearers of the church are conceived to be invested, a Presbyterian minister is assisted by *Lay Elders*. They are laymen in this respect, that they have no right to teach, or to dispense the Sacraments; and on this account they form an office in the Presbyterian Church inferior in rank and power to that of pastors. They generally discharge the office which originally belonged to the Deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor. But their peculiar business is expressed by the name *Ruling* Elders; for in every question of jurisdiction within the parish, they are the Spiritual Court, of which the minister is officially moderator; and in the Presbytery, of which the pastors of all the parishes within its bounds are officially members, *Lay-Elders* sit as the representatives of the several Sessions or Consistories."[1]

Calvin admitted Lay-Elders into Church Courts on what he conceived to be the sanction of primitive practice, and " as an effectual method of preventing the return of inordinate power in a superior order of Clergy."[2] With some variation

[1] Dr Hill's *Theol. Lect.* p. 170, 171.

[2] Dr Hill, p. 174.—On the other hand, Episcopalians remark, that neither the name nor thing of a Lay Elder, was ever known to any General or Provincial Council; nay,—nor

in name or in privileges, the office of Lay-Elders is found in all the Presbyterian Churches upon the Continent, and it forms an *essential* part of the constitution of the Church of Scotland.

See the *Directory*, *i. e.* a kind of regulation for the performance of religious worship, which was drawn up by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, at the instance of Parliament, in 1644. It was designed to supply the place of the Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer, the use of which they had abolished, and is still partly, but by no means strictly, adhered to by Presbyterians in general. It consists of some general heads, which are to be filled up at discretion; for it prescribes no form of prayer, or circumstances of external worship, nor obliges the people to any responses, excepting *Amen*.

It is generally bound up with the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and may also be found at the end of Neale's *History of the Puritans*.

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, EMINENT MEN, &c.—The established religion in Scotland is the Presbyterian; the two parties of Seceders, and the Society of Relief, are also strict Presbyterians; and in England one branch of the Protestant Dissenters are still called Presbyterians, though improperly.[1] The Presbyterians have

to any particular Church in the whole world, before Calvin's days.

[1] See the article "*English Presbyterians*," below.

long been numerous in Ireland, especially in the north; and on the Continent Presbyterianism still prevails, in Switzerland and in Holland.—Presbyterians are also numerous in most parts of North America. Their's is the prevailing religion throughout Connecticut, where it is said to reign "in all its rigour, despotism, and intolerance."[1] Although the letter of the law has established freedom of religious sentiments in Connecticut, such freedom is far from being known there. Its ministers, the zeal of its followers, and the appropriation of the places in the College to Presbyterians exclusively, afford very great advantages, to prevent it from being supplanted by any other form of religion. The Presbyterians are also the most numerous sect in North Carolina, especially in the western parts, which are inhabited by emigrants from Pennsylvania.

It is said that there were in America, in the year 1788, about 618 Presbyterian congregations, and 226 ministers; and their *General Assembly* usually meets at Philadelphia in the month of May. Calvin, Martyr, Beza, Bullinger, Zanchius, Blondel, Salmasius, Dallæus, Claude, &c. may be considered as among the chief luminaries of the foreign Presbyterian Churches; and at home none perhaps have been more eminent than Knox, Henry, M'Knight, Robertson, Campbell, and Blair.

[1] Duke de la Rochefoucault Liancourt's *Travels*, v. 1.

To the works already referred to in favour of Presbyterianism may be added, David Blondel's *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi*, which is a magazine for the writers against Episcopacy, and was drawn up at the request of the Westminster Assembly, particularly the Scots.[1] See also Samuel Rutherford's *Divine Right of Presbyteries*, and his *Divine Right of Church Government*; together with Petrus Molinæus *De Munere Pastorali*.

On the other side, in addition to the authors referred to under the articles *Episcopacy*, and *United Church of England and Ireland*, may be mentioned:—Bishop Beveridge in his *Annotations upon the Apostolic Canons*;—Hooker in the 7th book of his *Eccles. Polity*;—Bingham, Leslie, and John Jacques in his *Ordination by mere Presbyters void and null.* 1707.

Miscellaneous Remarks.—It is a principle in almost all Presbyterian Churches, never to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in private houses to any person, under any circumstances whatsoever.[2] But surely the Presbyterians have not adopted this principle from Calvin, who thus expresses himself on the subject:—"Why the Lord's Supper should not be denied to the sick, many and great reasons prevail with

[1] See its odd conclusion in Mr Jones's *Life of Bishop Horne*, p. 246.

[2] See Leslie's *Rehearsals*, No. 399.

me,—&c. &c. My judgment for the administration of private baptism, and giving the Lord's Supper to malefactors that desire it, and appear qualified for it, is the same." [1] He likewise required sponsors in baptism, besides or together with the father; [2] whereas now almost all Presbyterians, both at home and abroad, who practise infant-baptism, require no sponsors, but the father, and in some cases the mother; and they seldom administer baptism in private houses.

See Mr Calder's *Miscellany Numbers;* (fol. 1713;) *Relating to the Controversies about the Book of Common Prayer, Episcopal Government, the Power of the Church, in ordaining Rites and Ceremonies, &c. defended by Scripture, Reason, Antiquity, and the sentiments of the Learn'dest Reformers, particularly Mr John Calvin.* In this work various other particulars are produced, respecting which the sentiments of Calvin seem to correspond more with those of the Episcopalians than of the modern Presbyterians.

[1] Calv. *Epist.* 321,—363; and *Epist.* 185, ad *Monsbel.*

[2] Calv. *Epist.* 285; and to Knox, *Epist.* 302. So also Beza, *Epist.* 8.

INDEPENDENCY.

INDEPENDENTS.

Name.—The Independents, formerly distinct sect, but now comprehending the members of various denominations, as to respects Church Government and Discipline, are so called from their maintaining, that all Christian congregations are so many *Independent* Religious Societies;—or, that each congregation of Christians which meets in one house, for public worship, is a complete Church;—has sufficient power to perform every thing relating to ecclesiastical government within itself;—and, is in no respect subject or accountable to other churches.

This name of Independents, those who embraced these sentiments either assumed or approved; but when, about the middle of the 17th century, a great variety of sects in England sheltered themselves under the cover of it, and even seditious

subjects, that aimed at nothing less than the death of their Sovereign, and the destruction of the government, employed it as a mask to hide their deformity, "then the true and genuine Independents renounced this title, and substituted another less odious in its place, calling themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their religious assemblies *Congregational Churches*;"[1] names perhaps more appropriate, and by these they are still frequently known.

Their brethren in America also, with some exceptions, now disclaim the word *Independent* as applicable to them, and claim a sisterly relation to each other. The ministers of the Congregational Order are there generally associated for the purposes of licensing candidates for the ministry, and friendly intercourse and improvement.

Rise, Progress, &c.—The sect of the Independents was originally formed in Holland, about the year 1610, but their distinguishing doctrine seems to have been previously maintained by the *Brown-*

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 405. Note. Robinson, the founder of the sect, makes express use of the term *Independent* in explaining his doctrine relating to Ecclesiastical Government;—"Cætum quemlibet particularem esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem, immediatè et *Independenter* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo."—*Apologia*, cap. 5. p. 22. Dr Mosheim supposes it may possibly have been from this passage that the title of *Independents* was originally derived.

ists;[1] with whom, in consequence, they have been improperly confounded. Its founder was a Mr John Robinson of Norfolk; "a man who had much of the solemn piety of the times, and was master of a congregation of *Brownists* that had settled at *Leyden*. This well-meaning man, perceiving the defects that reigned in the discipline of Brown, and in the spirit and temper of his followers, employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them, and in modelling anew the society, in such a manner as to render it less odious to his adversaries, and less liable to the just censure of

[1] The *Brownists* were the followers of Robert Brown, a native of Rutlandshire, who was educated at Cambridge, but became a Non-Conformist about A. D. 1580; and after officiating for some time to a congregation of Dissenters at Norwich, went over to Holland and settled at Middleburgh in Zealand, where he and his followers obtained leave of the States to form a Church according to their own model.

He openly inveighed against the discipline and ceremonies of the Church; yet, on his return to England, he was promoted to a living in Northamptonshire; but being of violent passions, he was committed to Northampton gaol for an assault at the age of 80, where he died in 1630, after boasting that he had been committed to 32 prisons, in some of which he could not see his hand at noon-day!

Notwithstanding the severe persecutions to which his followers were exposed, they are said to have amounted in England, in 1592, to no less than 20,000; and the sect flourished there and in Holland about 100 years. Mr Ainsworth, the author of the learned Commentary on the Pentateuch, who was pastor of a congregation at Amsterdam, was one of its most distinguished members.

those true Christians, who looked upon charity as the end of the commandment.

The Independents, accordingly, were much more commendable than the Brownists in two respects.

They surpassed them both in the moderation of their sentiments, and the order of their discipline."[1]

A Mr Henry Jacobs, who had fled to Holland in consequence of Archbishop Bancroft's active exertions against the Puritans, meeting with Mr Robinson in that country, embraced his sentiments respecting church discipline; and, returning to England, established the first *Independent* or *Congregational* Church there in 1616.

Independency, however, "made at first but a very small progress in England; it worked its way slowly, and in a clandestine manner; and its members concealed their principles from public view, to avoid the penal laws that had been enacted against *Non-Conformists*. But during the reign of Charles I., when, amidst the shocks of civil and religious discords, the authority of the Bishops and the cause of Episcopacy began to decline, and more particularly about the year 1640, the *Independents* grew more courageous, and came forth, with an air of resolution and con-

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 405, 6. edit. 1806. Dr M. remarks, p. 399, Note, that the origin of the Independents may be found in Hornbeck's *Summa Controversiarum*, lib. x. p. 775.

fidence, to public view. After this period, their affairs took a prosperous turn; and in a little time, they became so considerable, both by their numbers, and by the reputation they acquired, that they vied in point of pre-eminence and credit, not only with the Bishops, but also with the *Presbyterians*, though at this time in the very zenith of their power. This rapid progress of the *Independents* was, no doubt, owing to a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners. During the administration of Cromwell, whose peculiar protection and patronage they enjoyed on more than one account, their credit arose to the greatest height, and their influence and reputation were universal; but after the restoration of Charles II., their cause declined, and they fell back gradually into their primitive obscurity. The sect, indeed, still subsisted; but in such a state of dejection and weakness, as engaged them, in the year 1691, under the reign of King William, to enter into an association with the Presbyterians residing in and about London, under certain heads of agreement, that tended to the maintenance of their respective institutions."[1]

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 406, 7.

In some of these articles, which are nine in number, both parties seem to depart from the primitive principles of their respective institutions.

They may be seen in the 2d vol. of Whiston's *Memoirs of his*

Independency was introduced into America from England about 1620 by Mr Jacobs, who died in Virginia in 1624; or, according to Dr Mosheim, by several English families of this sect that had been settled in Holland, who laid the foundation of a new settlement, afterwards called *New Plymouth;*—and, by successive Puritan emigrants in 1629, and 1633. These "English *Independents*, who retired to America on account of their dissention from the established religion of their country, claimed the honour of carrying thither the first rays of divine truth, and of beginning a work that has been since continued with such pious zeal and such abundant fruit; and, indeed, this claim is founded in justice."[1]

An attempt was also made by one *Morel*,[2] in the 16th century, to introduce the doctrine of this denomination into France; but it was condemned at the Synod of Rochelle, where Beza presided; and again in a Synod at the same place in 1644. So that Independency may be

Life and Writings; and the substance of them in Mosheim, as above, p. 408, 9.

[1] Dr Mosheim, who remarks, that the Puritans, *Mayhew*, *Sheppard*, and *Elliot*, made an eminent figure among the emigrants of 1633, particularly the last, who, by his zeal, dexterity, and indefatigable industry in converting the natives, merited, after his death, the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Indians.—Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 46, &c.

[2] I have not as yet been able to learn, whether Morel and Brown adopted the same system, and how long the one was prior to the other.

said to be peculiar to Great Britain, Ireland, North America, and the Batavian Republic.

DOCTRINES.—The distinguishing tenet of the Independents is maintained, with some shades of difference, not only by the three classes of Protestant Dissenters in England in general, and all those that are known by the name of *Congregationalists* or *Independents* elsewhere; but also by the *Sandemanians* in England, and by their brethren the *Glassites*, and by both classes of *Baptists* in Scotland: to which articles the reader is referred for the several doctrines and peculiarities which distinguish them from each other.

That which unites them, or rather which distinguishes them from other denominations of Christians, is their disclaiming, more or less, every form of union between churches, and assigning to each congregation the exclusive government of itself: and the religious doctrines of the Independents, properly so called, are, in general, strictly *Calvinistical*.[1]

See two Confessions of Faith, the one composed by Mr Robinson in behalf of the English Independents in Holland, and published at Leyden in 1619, entitled, *Apologia pro Exulibus Anglis, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur;* and the other drawn up in London 1658, by the principal members of this community in England, entitled, *The*

[1] John Goodwin is said to have been an Arminian, as many Independents have, no doubt, been since his time.

Savoy Confession, or, A Declaration of the Faith and order owned and practised by the Congregational Churches in England, agreed upon and consented unto by their Elders and Messengers, in their meeting at the Savoy, Oct. 12, 1658.[1]

From these two public and authentic pieces, not to mention other writings of the Independents, it evidently appears, says Dr Mosheim, "that they differed from the Presbyterians or Calvinists in no single point of any consequence, except that of ecclesiastical government."[2]

But many of the Independents, both at home and abroad, reject the use of all Creeds and Confessions drawn up by fallible men;[3] and merely require of their teachers a declaration of their belief in the truth of the Gospel and its leading

[1] This Synod at the *Savoy* was held by permission from Cromwell, granted a little before his death; and the *Confession* or *Declaration* then drawn up was reprinted in 1729.—Hornbeck also gave a Latin translation of it in 1659, and subjoined it to his *Epistolæ ad Duræum De Independentismo.*

[2] *Eccles. Hist.* vol. v. p. 401. See also *The Platform of Church Discipline*, or Confession of Faith, which was drawn up and agreed upon by the Elders and Messengers of the Congregational Churches in America, assembled in a Synod at Cambridge, in New England, in 1648.

[3] The American Independents, or *Congregationalists*, used to regulate their ecclesiastical proceedings in Massachusets, by the *Cambridge Platform of Discipline*, and in Connecticut by another, called the *Saybrook Platform of Discipline*; but since the Revolution, less regard has been paid to these Constitutions, and, in many instances, they are said to be wholly disused.—Hannah Adams's *View*, p. 455.

doctrines,—and of their adherence to the Scriptures as the sole standard of faith and practice, and the only criterion of faith. And some of them are said to require from all persons, who wish to be admitted into their communion, an account, either verbal or written, of what is called their experience; in which, not only a declaration of their faith in the Lord Jesus, and their purpose, by grace, to devote themselves to him, is expected, but likewise a recital of the steps by which they were led to a knowledge and profession of the Gospel.

Worship, Church Government, and Discipline.—Their public worship, which is conducted without form or ceremony, differs but little from that of the Presbyterians; and they still generally administer the Lord's Supper at the close of the afternoon's service.

In regard to Church Government and Discipline, it may be sufficient to remark here, after what has already been said, that though they disallow of parochial and provincial subordination, and do not think it necessary to assemble Synods; yet, if any be held, they look upon their resolutions as prudential counsels, but not as decisions to which they are obliged to conform.[1]

They consider it as their right to choose their

[1] See the *6th* Article of the Association of the *United Brethren* 1691, as mentioned above, p. 310.

own ministers and deacons;[1] and though they attribute no virtue to ordination, by imposition of hands, as conveying any new powers, yet they admit of, and practise it. Many of them, indeed, suppose, that the essence of ordination does not lie in the act of the ministers who assist, but in the choice and call of the people, and the candidate's acceptance of that call; so that their ordination may be considered only as a *public declaration* of that agreement.[2]

Though they consider their own form of ecclesiastical government as of divine institution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the Apostles, nay, by the Apostles themselves, and, of course, look upon every other form as unscriptural; yet, with more candour and charity than their predecessors the Brownists, they acknowledge, that true religion and solid piety may flourish in those communities, which are under the jurisdiction of Bishops, or the government of Synods and Presbyteries.

They are also more attentive than the Brownists were to keep up a distinction between mini-

[1] In Article *5th*, the *United Brethren* acknowledge, that "the office of a Deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to their office to receive, lay out, and distribute the stock of the Church to its proper uses."

[2] This doctrine seems to have prevailed in Scotland, when Presbyterianism was first established here in the latter end of the 16th century.—See Courayer's *Defence of the English Ordinations*, p. 21. edit. 1728.

sters and people; for while the Brownists allowed promiscuously all ranks and orders of men to teach in public, and to perform the other pastoral functions, the original Independents always had fixed and regular ministers, approved of by their people. Nor do they in general allow every person to pray or teach in public, who may think himself qualified for that important office, before he has submitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and been approved of by the heads of the congregation.

EMINENT MEN, NUMBERS, &c.—This denomination has produced many persons eminent both for piety and learning, whose works will, no doubt, reflect lasting honour on their abilities and acquirements. Of the English Independents of the 17th century, Dr Owen, (the learned author of the *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, &c.) and John and Thomas Goodwin, were the most distinguished, and the chief leaders of the party; and it is worthy of remark, that the second, as well as the first of these, vindicated the king's murder, which occasioned his being exempted from pardon at the Restoration, but he was never proceeded against.

I have not as yet seen any calculation of the supposed number of members belonging to this denomination, but can readily believe it to be considerable, and that it has increased of late years; nor is it unlikely that it is still increasing more or less. The Congregationalists are sup-

posed to be the most numerous denomination in the United States, and are said to have upwards of a thousand congregations in New England and nearly half that number of congregations in Massachusets alone. In England they are thought to be more numerous than the Baptists; and in Scotland, they have received a considerable accession of late, by the zeal and exertions of the Messrs Haldane and their friends, and fellow labourers.

Miscellaneous Remarks.—To avoid, as much as may be, the multiplying of articles unnecessarily, as bespeaking distinct denominations, already by far too numerous, I have here included the American *Congregationalists* among the Independents; both as they originally sprang from them, and as they still seem to maintain the same doctrine with them on the subject of Church Government and Discipline, although they have now, as already observed, disclaimed the name of Independent. Indeed, it might be well that this term were universally disclaimed and laid aside, as the name of a sect; for other denominations may perhaps have as good a right to it, as the one which has been distinguished by it. No one, I presume, would assume it, to the prejudice of their dependence upon our Lord and Saviour; and, with respect to the influence of men, Presbyterians, or Episcopalians, may, in fact, have the advantage of Independents, and their ministers be more independent of their brethren, than

theirs; and they doubtless are more independent of their people.

Such are the different sentiments of professing Christians on the subject of Church Government and Discipline; and thus do the adherents in general of each lay claim to the exclusive right of divine or apostolical institution, and insist that the first churches were modelled according to their particular plan. How far their respective claims are well founded, and whose plan approaches the nearest to the primitive model, different readers will judge very differently; yet every reader, I presume, will be glad to learn, and many will no doubt pay some deference to the judgment of an able and attentive enquirer into ecclesiastical antiquity, who, after examining and balancing the arguments for the above three forms of Church Government, as supported by experience, observes, that they "may be briefly stated thus:—In no one instance does the *Independent* plan appear to have a solid foundation either in Scripture or antiquity; yet the interference of the people, and the share of authority exercised by them, though never on the plan of Independent Congregations, gives some plausible colour to *Independency*. The *Presbyterian system* seems to be scriptural and primitive, so far as the institution of the clergy is concerned, but defective for want of a bishop. The *Episcopal form*, no doubt, ob-

[1] See a tract intitled, *Apologia*, or *Four Letters to a Minister of an Independent Church, by a Minister of the Church of England*, 12mo. 1784, printed for *Buckland*, Paternoster-Row.

tained in all the primitive churches without exception, but—what effectually checks the pride of those who are fond of the pomp of hierarchy,—it must be confessed, that *Ancient Episcopacy* had no secular mixtures and appendages."[1]

I will only further remark on this subject, that, while some eminent divines have warmly maintained the *Jus Divinum* of Church Government, and earnestly contended for their own particular mode, as an essential part of "the faith once delivered to the Saints;" others have wholly disclaimed it, and viewed the subject (too much, doubtless,) as a matter of indifference.—Thus, of Mr *Calamy* it has been said, that "he fairly lays aside the divine right of Presbyterian discipline, and does in effect own himself indifferent to the *Episcopal, Presbyterian,* or *Independent* scheme, as, indeed, Mr *Baxter* had done before him."[2]

[1] Milner's *History of the Church of Christ*, vol. i. p. 587.

[2] Mr Johnson's *Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, *Pref.* to vol. ii. p. 86. Edit. 1723.

LUTHERANISM,

AND

LUTHERANS.

NAME.—A natural sentiment of gratitude to Luther,[1] the extraordinary man, whom Providence employed as the honoured instrument of the foundation and establishment of the Church now to be considered, which is the first in point of time of all Protestant churches, excited his followers to assume his name, and to call their community "*The Lutheran Church.*"

RISE, PROGRESS, AND HISTORY.—The beginning of the 16th century witnessed an event the most glorious that had occurred since the days of the Apostles, the reformation of corrupted Christianity, by the blessing of God on the exertions of Luther and his associates. It is true, most of

[1] His real name was *Lotter* or *Lauter*, which he afterwards changed into Luther.

the corruptions in the Church of Rome which he condemned, had been attacked long before his appearance, and almost the same opinions which he propagated had been published in different places, and were supported by the same arguments. Waldus in the 12th century, Wickliff in the 14th, and Huss in the 15th, had inveighed against the errors of Popery with great boldness, and confuted them with more ingenuity and learning than could have been expected in those illiterate ages in which they flourished. But all these premature attempts towards a reformation proved abortive. Such feeble lights, incapable of dispelling the darkness which then covered the church, were soon extinguished; and though the doctrines of these pious men produced some effects, and left some traces in the countries where they taught, they were neither extensive nor considerable. Many powerful causes contributed to facilitate Luther's progress, which either did not exist, or did not operate with full force in their days; and at the critical and mature juncture when he appeared, various circumstances concurred in rendering each step which he took successful.

Hence, while the worthy and pious professors of Christianity almost despaired of seeing that reformation on which their most ardent desires and expectations were bent; an obscure and inconsiderable person arose on a sudden, and laid the foundation of this long expected change, by opsing, with undaunted resolution, his single force

to the torrent of papal ambition and despotism. This wonderful person was Martin Luther, a native of *Aisleben*, in Upper Saxony, and born in 1483, who, after passing through the usual stages of education with honour, became a monk of the *Augustinian Eremites*, who were one of the mendicant orders, and was professor of divinity in the newly erected academy at *Wittemberg* in 1517, when *Tetzel*, an agent of Pope Leo X. arrived there with a commission from the pontiff to grant plenary indulgences to every person, who should contribute to the expence of building the cathedral of St Peter at Rome.

Luther, scandalized at this venal remission of all sins, past, present, or to come,[1] set his face against a measure so inimical to the interests of piety and virtue, and exposed, with vehement indignation, the impious traffic from the pulpit and the press. None of the qualities or talents that characterized Luther were of a common or ordinary kind; his genius was truly great and unparalleled, and he was particularly distinguished for Scriptural knowledge, piety, an unconquerable spirit, and invincible magnanimity, patience, and perseverance. He began to expose the doctrine of Indulgences in 95 propositions, maintained publicly at Wittemberg in September 1517, and his arguments and his boldness were equally admired throughout Germany. Leo, naturally fond of ease, and occupied in the pursuits of pleasure

[1] See the form of the Indulgences, at full length, in Dr Robertson's *History of Charles V.* 8vo, 1782, vol. ii. p. 107, note.

and ambition, at first despised what he deemed a mere squabble among monks; but he was soon roused by the tidings of Luther's rapid success, and by the clamours of the Popish ecclesiastics for aid and for vengeance. He then directed *Cajetan*, his legate in Germany, to summon him into his presence, and command him to recant. Luther obeyed the summons, and appeared before the Cardinal, but refused to retract antecedently to conviction.

As yet he had no thoughts of questioning the supremacy of the Pope; nor any suspicions of the radical corruptions of the Romish Church. But those corruptions are so linked together, and so dependent one upon another, that the discovery of one naturally draws after it the detection of more. Such was the progress in the mind of Luther. While attempts at accommodation were taking place in Germany, the pontiff, instigated by the impatient fury of those around him, issued a bull in 1520, denouncing destruction against Luther as an excommunicated heretic, unless he should recant in sixty days. The reformer, whom diligent and deep researches into the Scriptures had by this time firmly convinced of the radical corruption of the Church of Rome, immediately and publicly relinquished her communion.

Nor did he long stand forth the sole adversary of this corruption, but was soon encouraged by the successes of a distant coadjutor; for the sale of indulgences at Zurich had stirred up the spirit of *Zuinglius*, a man equal to Luther in zeal and

intrepidity, and more speedily convinced of the duty of renouncing the Romish Church.

Oecolampadius also ably assisted in the work of reformation in Switzerland, in the greater part of which it was rapidly established: and in Germany, the efforts of Luther in this arduous undertaking were soon powerfully seconded by other learned men, as *Melancthon, Carolostadius, Osiander, Bucer*, &c. &c.

Yet, notwithstanding the assistance which he had from his predecessors, and from many of his cotemporaries, some of whom were scarcely inferior to himself, Luther has, among friends, the whole glory, and, among enemies, bears the whole odium of the work, and is still called the *Apostle of Germany.*

In the following year he was requested to appear before his avowed enemy, the Emperor Charles V. in the diet at Worms, when, unmoved by the apprehensions of his friends, who reminded him of the fate of Huss, he instantly obeyed, and there acknowledged, that his writings had occasionally been violent and acrimonious; but refused to retract his opinions, until they should be proved erroneous by the Scriptures. An edict, pronouncing him an excommunicated criminal, and commanding the seizure of his person as soon as the duration of the safe conduct which he had obtained should have expired, was immediately promulgated. *Frederic the Wise*, Elector of Saxony, who had all along countenanced him, without professing his doctrines, now with-

drew him from the stage. As Luther was returning from Worms, a troop of horsemen, in masks, rushed from a wood, seized him, and conveyed him to the castle of *Wartenberg*, where he was concealed nine months, encouraging his adherents by his pen, and cheered in return by accounts of the rapid diffusion of his doctrines.

John, the successor of Frederic, took a decisive step, and established the reformed religion in 1527 throughout his dominions.

In a diet at Spires, held about the same time, the execution of the edict of Worms against the Lutherans, now too formidable to be oppressed with impunity, was suspended until the convocation of a general council, to remedy the disorders of the Church. But in another diet held at the same place, in 1529, the suspension was revoked by a decree obtained through the influence of Charles; who then found himself at more leisure to push forward his views against the supporters of the Reformation. Against this new decree, six princes, and the deputies of thirteen imperial cities and towns, solemnly *protested*;[1] and from this the appellation of *Protestants* became common to all, who embraced the reformed religion. At the diet of *Augsburg*, in Swabia, the following year, a clear statement of the reformed faith, drawn up by Luther and Melanothon, was presented to Charles and the diet, on behalf of the Protestant

[1] See the article *Protestantism* above, p. 81, 2, or Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 73, 4.

members of the empire; and hence it obtained the name of "the *Confession* of *Augsburg*."

By this time the reformed tenets were daily gaining ground in most of the countries of Europe; and, among others, they had obtained perfect toleration in Denmark, and were completely adopted in Sweden, both which kingdoms adhere to the principles of the Lutheran Church to the present day.

Luther, after having written much, and exerted himself on various occasions with a wonderful firmness and intrepidity, departed this life in 1546, lamented by his followers, and revered by the Protestant world. His temper, it must be confessed, was violent; but the times in which he lived seem to have required such a disposition for the work in which he was engaged. He lived to see the famous Council of Trent opened; but it was summoned too late, for the church which it was meant to support was before then shaken to its foundation, and these convulsive throes soon terminated in the *Reformation*.[1]

On the death of Luther, *Philip Melancthon* was placed at the head of the Lutheran Church; a man inferior to him perhaps in nothing so much

[1] Luther's works were collected after his death, and printed at Wittemberg, in 7 vols. fol.—In the Preface to the 2d vol. may be found, in most editions, an account of his Life drawn up by Melancthon after Luther's decease; and an abstract of it is given in the Appendix to vol. iv. part 1st, of Mr Milner's *Hist. of the Church of Christ*.—See also a short and excellent account of Luther in Cave's *Hist. Liter.* vol. ii. p. 249, 250, Append.

as in courage and firmness of mind. But scarcely had they and their friends triumphed over the enemies of reformation, when they became the prey of intestine disputes, and were divided among themselves in such a deplorable manner, that, till Melancthon's death, which happened in 1560, and in some degree till the end of the 16th century, the Protestant states of Germany were a scene of strife and contention; a circumstance which the Church of Rome did not fail to turn to the advancement of her own interests. It is not necessary to mention here all the subjects of these religious quarrels; nor indeed would this be an easy task. For some account of them, and for further particulars of the history of this Church, recourse may be had to Mosheim, who was himself one of the most eminent Lutheran divines of the last century.

"The rise of the Reformation," he tells us, "must be dated from that remarkable period (1520,) when the Pontiff, Leo X. drove Martin Luther, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy, by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication.

"It began to acquire a regular form, and a considerable degree of stability and consistence, from the year 1530, when the system of doctrine and morality it had adopted was drawn up and presented to the diet at *Augsburg*. And it was raised to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, totally independent on the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, in consequence of the treaty

concluded at Passau, in the year 1552, between Charles V. and Maurice, Elector of Saxony, relating to the religious affairs of the empire."[1]

Thus was the Reformation established in many parts of Germany, where it continues to this day; nor have the efforts of the Popish powers at any time been able to suppress it, or even to prevent its gaining ground. It was not, however, in Germany alone that a reformation of religion took place. Almost all the kingdoms of Europe began to open their eyes to the truth about the same time; but although Lutherans and Protestants were at first synonimous terms, they did not long continue so; for in consequence of the disputes which soon arose among the reformers, they in a short time broke off into distinct parties under different leaders or heads. So that those who now adhere to the doctrines of Luther, or rather, who are still called by his name, make but a small proportion of that body of Christians, who come under the general denomination of *Protestants*. The disciples of Calvin soon separated from this Church; and the term *Reformed* has long been used on the Continent to distinguish the other Protestants of various denominations, of whom the *Calvinists* are by far the most numerous, from the Lutherans;

[1] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 282. Yet the Doctor elsewhere tells us (vol. vi. p. 18.) that the Lutheran Church "dates its foundation from the year 1517."

and it is equally applied to the friends of Episcopacy and Presbytery.

In the 17th century, the principles of the Lutheran Church were carried into Asia, Africa, and America, by several persons, who fixed their habitations in those distant regions, and were also introduced into some parts of Europe, where they had hitherto been unknown.

The Lutheran writers, Sleidan and Seckendorf, whose names are illustrious, have detailed the history of their sect in the true spirit of philosophy; and on the score of impartiality in narration, and candid reflections, they have left little to be desired. We, however, can now connect with the grand revolution which they so faithfully described, abundantly more of its consequences than it was in their power to delineate.

This is done, in some measure, by M. Villars, in a late work, intitled "*An Essay on the Spirit and Influence of the Reformation by Luther.*"

DOCTRINES.—The system of faith, embraced by the Lutherans, was drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, and presented to the Emperor Charles V. in 1530, at the diet of *Augusta* or *Augsburg*, whence, as already observed, it was called the *Augustan* or *Augsburg Confession.*

[1] The frauds and falsehoods of Maimbourg's *History of Lutheranism* are fully detected and refuted in Seckendorf's incomparable work, intitled, "*Commentar. Histor. Apologet. de Lutheranismo, sive de Reformatione Religionis,*" &c. published at Leipsic in 1694.

It is divided into two parts, of which the *former*, containing twenty-one articles, was designed to represent, with truth and perspicuity, the religious opinions of the Reformers; and the *latter*, containing seven articles, is employed in pointing out and confuting the seven capital errors and abuses that occasioned their separation from the Church of Rome. [1]

The leading doctrines of this confession are the true and essential divinity of the Son of God; his substitution and vicarious sacrifice; and the necessity, freedom, and efficacy of divine grace.

From the time of Luther to the present day, no change has been introduced into the system of doctrine and discipline that is received in this Church; so that the ancient confessions and rules that were drawn up to point out the tenets that were to be believed, and the rites and ceremonies that were to be performed, still remain in their full authority, and are considered as the sacred guardians of the Lutheran faith and worship. The method, however, of illustrating, enforcing, and defending the doctrines of Christianity, has undergone several changes in the Lutheran Church; [2] and notwithstanding the confessions continue the same, some of the doctrines that were warmly maintained by Luther, have been wholly abandoned by his followers of late.

[1] Viz. Communion in one kind—the forced celibacy of the clergy—private masses—auricular confession—legendary traditions—monastic vows—and the excessive power of the Church.

[2] Mosheim, vol. vi. p. 19.

In particular, the doctrines of *absolute predestination, human impotence, and irresistible grace,* have seldom met with a more zealous advocate than Luther; and hence they have been called the doctrines of the *Reformation.*[1] But, as in these times he has very few followers in this respect, among those that bear his name, they are now generally known by the name of *Calvinistic doctrines.* On the subject of *Predestination and Election* nothing indeed is said in the *Augustan Confession*; but the Lutherans now maintain, in regard to the divine decrees, that they respect the salvation or misery of men, in consequence of "a previous knowledge of their sentiments and character," and not with the Calvinists, as founded on "the mere will of God."

Luther at one time rejected the Epistle of *St. James* as inconsistent with the doctrine of St. Paul in regard to Justification; he also set aside the *Apocalypse;* but both these are now received as canonical in the Lutheran Church.

The members of this Church are distinguished principally by maintaining the following doctrines:—"That neither the Pope nor any other man possesses any authority in matters of faith, but that the Scriptures are, as a collection of inspired, sufficient, and clear writings, the only source whence our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice, must be drawn, and to which human reason ought, in every re-

[1] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 330. Note (b.)

spect, to submit and yield;—that man is naturally incapable of thinking or doing any good, valid before God;—that justification and future happiness are the effect of the meritorious and vicarious death of Jesus, as God and man in one person;—that faith is the necessary condition of grace on the part of man, which faith is itself the gift of divine grace;—that good works are of value only as far as they are the effect of faith;—that, however, there exists no unconditional predestination, and that the real body and blood of Jesus is united in a mysterious manner, through the consecration, with the bread and wine, and are received *with and under* them in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.—This last doctrine they distinguish by the word *Consubstantiation*, and it formed, together with the doctrine of Predestination, for a long time, the principal party-wall between the Lutherans and Calvinists; but it, as well as some of the other doctrines, has been, if not formally at least virtually abandoned, or considerably modified by a great number of Lutherans."[1]

[1] Luther attempted to illustrate the doctrine of *Consubstantiation* by saying, that Jesus Christ "is in the bread, just as fire is in the red hot iron." See his Treatise *De Captivitate Babylonica*, and his book against King Henry VIII.

On the other hand, some of his followers, who are disposed to reject or to modify this doctrine, remark, that it admits of no illustration, and that "it was probably its mysteriousness, together with the contradiction which it met with, that recommended it to the excellent Luther, whose principal foible

Towards the close of the 17th century, the Lutherans began to entertain a greater liberality of sentiment than they had before adopted, though in many places they persevered longer in severe and despotic principles than other Protestant Churches. They now enjoy an unbounded liberty of dissenting from the decisions of those Symbols or Creeds, which were once deemed almost infallible rules of faith and practice, and of declaring their dissent in the manner they judge most expedient. Mosheim attributes this change in their sentiments to that maxim of the Arminians and others which they generally adopted, that "Christians were accountable to God alone for their religious opinions; and that no individual could be justly punished by the magistrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society."—It were to be wished, that this religious liberty, which the dictates of equity must approve, had never degenerated into that unbridled licentiousness that holds nothing sacred, but tramples under foot the solemn truths of religion, and throws contempt upon its ministers and institutions.

The Lutherans call their standard books, which contain their articles of faith, and rules of disci-

(though, in his circumstances, a highly useful one,) it was, to adhere to a doctrine he had once asserted with a warmth proportioned to the opposition which he found."

pline, *Symbolical*, from a Greek word that signifies *collection* or *compilation:* but these, which all professors of divinity and all candidates for the ministry must subscribe, have no authority but what they derive from the scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey. For it is the grand and leading principle of the Lutheran Church, that "the Holy Scriptures are the only source from whence we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice."

"The chief and the most respectable of these human productions is the *Confession of Augsburg*, with the annexed *Defence* of it against the objections of the Roman Catholic doctors. In the next rank may be placed, the *Articles of Smalcald*, as they are commonly called, together with the Shorter and Larger *Catechisms* of Luther, designed for the instruction of youth, and the improvement of persons of riper years.—To these standard-books most churches add the *Form of Concord;* which, though it be not universally received, has not, on that account, occasioned any animosity or disunion."[1]

The edition of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 is their legitimate formulary of faith, and is called *Augustana Confessio invariata*. It was altered by Melancthon, in a subsequent edition,

[1] Mosheim, iv. 284. where he refers for an account of the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, to Christ. Kocheri *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 114.

which is called *variata*. The alterations are not perhaps very material; but the Lutherans, so early as the year 1579, when the *Form of Concord* was drawn up, made the distinction, and they have never admitted it in this new shape, as one of the standard-books of their faith and doctrine. [1]

The reply which Melancthon made to the refutation which the Roman Catholic doctors attempted of the *Augsburg Confession*, when presented at the diet of that city, was afterwards published under the title of *Apologia Confessionis Augustanæ*, and is the defence of that Confession mentioned by Dr Mosheim above, as annexed to it: and the articles here mentioned were drawn up at *Smalcald* in Franconia by Luther, on the occasion of a meeting of the Protestant electors, princes, and states, at that place in 1537, for the defence of their religion.

The *Form of Concord* was at first composed at *Torgaw*, and afterwards reviewed at *Berg*, a Benedictine Monastery near Magdeburg, and consists of two parts. In the *first* is contained a system of doctrine, drawn up according to the fancy of *James Andreæ*, and the other five Lutheran doctors who assisted him in preparing it, or at least in reviewing it, at Berg; and among other matter, it maintains the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's body, together with its real

[1] Some have told us that the *Variata* Edition is that of 1540; but I am at a loss to reconcile this opinion with that edition's being given in the Oxford *Sylloge Confessionum*.

and peculiar presence in the eucharist. In the *second* is exhibited a formal condemnation of all those who differed from these six doctors; and as it brands with the denomination of heretics, and excludes from the communion of the Church, all Christians, of all nations, who refuse to subscribe these doctrines, we cannot be surprised that it has not been universally received.

It is likewise worthy of notice here, that Melancthon collected and digested the doctrines of the Church, which he so eminently adorned, into a body of divinity, under the vague title of *Loci Communes*, or, *A common place Book of Theology*. This compilation, which was afterwards, at different times, reviewed, corrected, and enlarged by its author, was in such high repute during the 16th century, and even in succeeding times, that it was considered as an universal model of doctrine for all those, who either instructed the people by their public discourses, or promoted the knowledge of religion by their writings.[1]

Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies.—In 1523 Luther drew up a liturgy, or form of prayer and administration of the Sacraments, which, in many things, differed but little from the mass of the Church of Rome.[2] But he did not mean to confine his followers to this form; and hence

[1] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 306.

[2] Vide *Lutheri formam Missæ per Ecclesiam Wirtemb.* Inter Lutheri opera, tom. ii. p. 384.

every country, where Lutheranism prevails, has its own liturgy, which is the rule of proceeding in every thing that relates to external worship, and the public exercise of religion.

"These rules, however, are not of an immutable nature, like those institutions which bear the stamp of a divine authority, but may be augmented, corrected, or illustrated by the order of the Sovereign, when such changes appear evidently to be necessary or expedient.

"The liturgies used in the different countries that have embraced the system of Luther, agree perfectly in all the essential branches of religion, in all matters that can be looked upon as of real moment and importance; but they differ widely in many things of an indifferent nature, concerning which the Holy Scriptures are silent, and which compose that part of the public religion that derives its authority from the wisdom and appointment of men. Assemblies for the celebration of divine worship meet every where at stated times. Here the Holy Scriptures are read publicly, prayers and hymns are addressed to the Deity, the Sacraments are administered, and the people are instructed in the knowledge of religion, and excited to the practice of virtue by the discourses of their ministers."[z]

The Lutherans are perhaps those, of all Protestants, who differ least from the Church of

[z] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 288, 289.

Rome, not only in regard to their doctrine of *Consubstantiation* already mentioned, *i e.* their affirming that the body and blood of Christ are materially present in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though in an incomprehensible manner; or, that the partakers of the Lord's Supper receive *along with*, *under*, and *in* the bread and wine, the *real* body and blood of Christ: but likewise as they represent several religious practices and ceremonies, which are retained in no other Protestant Church, as tolerable, and some of them useful. Among these may be reckoned —the form of exorcism in the celebration of Baptism[1]—the use of wafers in the administration of the Lord's Supper—the private confession of sins —the use of images, of incense, and of lighted tapers in their churches, (particularly at the celebration of the Lord's Supper,) with a crucifix on the altar; all of them practices of the Church of Rome.—But some of these things are not general, being confined to particular parts.

"Every church," says Dr Mosheim, "was allowed the privilege of retaining so much of the ancient form of worship as might be still observed without giving offence, and as seemed suited to the character of the people, the genius of the government, and the nature and circumstances of the place where it was founded. Hence it has happened, that, even so far down as the present

[1] This, however, I am credibly informed, is now abolished in most Lutheran states.—See Dr M'Laine's Note (l) to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 352.

times, the Lutheran churches differ considerably one from the other, with respect both to the number and the nature of their religious ceremonies; a circumstance," adds he, "so far from tending to their dishonour, that it is, on the contrary, a very striking proof of their wisdom and moderation."[1]

"Private confession was formerly universally in practice among the Lutherans, though they never held, with the Roman Catholics, forgiveness of sin in this world to be necessary for the forgiveness in a future world; and it was connected with the disgraceful custom of making, on that occasion, a small present to the clergyman confessor. This confession-money, as it is called, constituted, in many places, an important part of the clergyman's salary; but it has been, I suppose, as well as the private confession itself, in most of the Lutheran countries and congregations, abolished, and another source of revenue substituted in its place. A sort of public and general confession is in use as a preparation for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

"The mode of administration of this holy rite of our religion differs in different places; but some of the customs arising from the notions prevalent on that subject in the Roman Church have generally been preserved. The clergyman himself gives both bread and wine.

"Confirmation is a practice universally adopted

[1] Vol. iv. p. 286.

in the Lutheran church, but it is considered as a human institution only, retained on account of its usefulness. It is not confined to the bishops, but performed by every pastor of a congregation, commonly on young people at the age of from 14 to 16 years, and always preceded by a complete course of instruction in the principles of religion, which forms one of the essential duties of every pastor. It consists in the imposition of hands, after the young Christians have professed their faith in the principal doctrines of Christianity, and is always immediately followed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper."

Among the days that are held sacred in the Lutheran Church, (besides that which is celebrated every week, in memory of Christ's resurrection,) we may reckon all such as were signalized by those glorious and important events that proclaim the celestial mission of the Saviour, and the divine authority of his holy religion :—such, for example, are the nativity, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Son of God ; the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, &c. And some churches religiously observe the days that were formerly set apart for celebrating the memory of the *Twelve Apostles*.

"The Reformation by Luther is likewise commemorated annually.

"In their churches they have usually organs ; and sacred music, by full band, forms, particularly in Germany, a part of the public worship on all their festivals. The dress of the clergy during

the performance of their duties is not every where quite the same, but consists generally of the black gown, a band, or instead of it in some places a sort of white Spanish frill or collar, and a white surplice. The last is only worn on particular occasions."

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.—In every country where Lutheranism is established, the supreme head of the state is, at the same time, the supreme visible ruler of the Church: but "all civil rulers of the Lutheran persuasion are effectually restrained, by the fundamental principles of the doctrine they profess, from any attempts to change or destroy the established rule of faith and manners,—to make any alteration in the essential doctrines of their religion, or in any thing that is intimately connected with them,—or, to impose their particular opinions upon their subjects in a despotic and arbitrary manner."[1]

The councils, or societies, appointed by the Sovereign to watch over the interests of the Church, and to govern and direct its affairs, are composed of persons versed in the knowledge both of civil and ecclesiastical law, and, according to a very ancient denomination, are called *Consistories*.

The internal government of the Lutheran Church seems to be somewhat anomalous; it bears no resemblance to *Independency*, and yet it is equally removed from *Episcopacy* on the one

[1] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 287.

hand, and from *Presbyterianism* on the other, if we except the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, (including Norway,) in which the form of ecclesiastical government that preceded the Reformation is retained; purged, indeed, from the superstitions and abuses that rendered it so odious.

"This constitution of the Lutheran hierarchy," says Dr Mosheim, "will not seem surprising, when the sentiments of that people, with respect to ecclesiastical polity, are duly considered. On the one hand, they are persuaded that there is no law, of divine authority, which points out a distinction between the ministers of the Gospel with respect to rank, dignity, or prerogatives; and therefore they recede from *Episcopacy*.

"But, on the other hand, they are of opinion, that a certain subordination, a diversity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, is not only highly useful, but also necessary to the perfection of church communion, by connecting, in consequence of a mutual dependence, more closely together the members of the same body; and thus they avoid the uniformity of the *Presbyterian* governments. They are not, however, agreed with respect to the extent of this subordination, and the degrees of superiority and precedence that ought to distinguish their doctors; for in some places this is regulated with much more regard to the ancient rules of Church Government, than is discovered in others."[1]

[1] Vol. iv. p. 287.

"The Protestants of Germany, in general, and the Lutherans in particular, possess no universally adopted rule of Church government, but the variety, which has hitherto existed in the political constitution of the states composing the venerable fabric of the empire, extends also to the ecclesiastical regulations. Since the secularisation of the bishopric of *Osnabruck*, by a decree of the diet in 1802, there is no Lutheran bishopric in Germany. The highest ecclesiastical officers are the *Superintendents*, whose authority and influence are, however, considerably inferior to those of our diocesan bishops. In some provinces they preside in the *Consistories*, though more frequently the station of president is occupied by a civil delegate of the prince, and their rank among the clergy of their diocese is, that they are *primi inter pares*. They do not pretend to a divine right or lineal succession from the Apostles, but are the chief pastors of a district, performing all the usual pastoral duties, and have a more or less limited inspection over the clergy of that district. They hold visitations at all the towns and villages under their inspection, and report the result of their enquiries into the state of the congregations, their schools, and the conduct of their ministers, to their respective consistories, from which they themselves receive instructions in all matters of great importance. In most of the free imperial cities, and in many that once were so, they bear the name of *Seniors*, instead of that of Superintendents. In most provinces

and states of some extent there are *Superintendents General*, and *Superintendents Special*. The latter have a small district assigned to their care, subject to the controul of the former. The right of ordaining is generally vested in the *Superintendent General*, though this rite may, according to the canonical law of Lutheranism in Germany, be performed by any clergyman commissioned for that purpose by the head of the Church, *i. e.* the highest civil authority.

"We still find, particularly in the South of Germany, among the dignitaries of the Lutheran Church, *Abbots*, who are frequently at the same time Superintendents, and possess the rank as states of the country and a considerable share of the revenues, which their Roman Catholic predecessors enjoyed.

"The right of presentation to livings is, in most states, vested in and exercised by the prince or the ecclesiastical courts; though in all parts of Germany, many livings are in the gift of the owners of estates. In some places the people have a right to choose their own ministers, who, however, cannot enter upon their office until they have been approved of, and their appointment has been confirmed by the civil authority. The appointment of *Superintendents* is, throughout Germany, the privilege of the *Prince*.

"In some provinces the consistories have still jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs, divorces, &c.; and, every where, the superintendence of the education of youth in the parochial, as well as higher

schools, forms an essential part of the duties, both of the superior and inferior clergy. Their revenues arise from glebe-land;—in some places from tythes, and the estates belonging to the Churches;—or, they consist in fixed salaries allowed to them by the government. These revenues are, upon the whole, very moderate, and exclude all splendour from the Church establishment.

"The constitution of the Lutheran Church in *Sweden*, bears great resemblance to that of the Church of England. The clergy consist of the Archbishop of *Upsala*, who differs from the Bishops only in rank, and has no jurisdiction over them, *ten* Bishops, *three* Superintendents, with all the rights and duties of the Bishops, Provosts, Pastors, and Chaplains. Neither in Sweden, however, nor in Denmark, is that authority and dignity attached to the Episcopal office, which the Church of England bestows upon her dignitaries. When a bishopric becomes vacant, the clergy of the diocese elect by ballot three candidates, out of whom the king appoints one. Upon the death of the Archbishop of Upsala, who is Primate of Sweden, and the only Archbishop among the Lutherans, each consistory in the kingdom proposes a successor, and the king elects from among those who have been proposed.—The ordination of a Bishop is usually performed by the Archbishop; though it may be performed by any bishop. Every bishop is also pastor of a congregation. To every bishopric a consistory is attached, in which the bishop presides, and which

keeps a very watchful eye over the conduct of the clergy and the teachers in the public schools.

"The church discipline in Sweden appears to be stricter than in any other country, and the Swedes adhere faithfully and scrupulously to the original forms and doctrines of Lutheranism, for which the blood of their ancestors was shed. The clergy possess among them great privileges and powerful influence. The Archbishop and the Bishops are members of the diet. Their revenues arise principally from tythes, and are considerable in proportion to the value of money.—They wear, only when in the exercise of their official duties, a distinguished dress, and the Archbishop is only on peculiarly solemn occasions permitted to wear the mitre and the crook.

"In *Denmark* the king appoints the Bishops, who are now *seven* in Denmark,[1] *four* in Norway, and *one* in Iceland. The Bishops of *Copenhagen* and of *Christiana* rank above the others, but the Bishop of *Zealand* is the proper metropolitan, who alone consecrates the others, and is himself consecrated by the Bishop of *Fyhn*. He also anoints the king, and is consulted in all ecclesiastical affairs, for which reason he now resides at Copenhagen. The Bishops, whose duties are similar to those of the Superintendents in Germany,[2] send an annual

[1] An alteration has lately taken place in Denmark in the number of Bishops.

[2] The denomination of Superintendent, which was given at the time of the Reformation, under Christern III. to the former Bishops of Denmark, after they were bereft of their secular authority, is no longer in use in that country.

report to the king respecting the state of the churches and schools of their diocese; they likewise convene, in conjunction with the Provosts, every six months, a synod or meeting of the ministers under their inspection; where they consult on the ecclesiastical situation of the diocese, read the new royal rescripts, and superintend the concerns of the institutions for the poor.

"They have no jurisdiction over matrimonial affairs, and are otherwise considerably restricted in the exercise of their authority. They are not distinguished by a peculiar dress; only in the exercise of their episcopal duties they wear a white surplice and a cloak of gold and silver tissue.—None of them has an annual revenue of more than 7000 dollars, (L.1400,) or less than 2000, (L.400.)

"Denmark has 160 Provosts, who resemble the special Superintendents in Germany. The clergy enjoy at present a third part of the former tythes; two thirds are become the property of the king and the lord of the manor. The right of presentation to livings, which, in Denmark as well as in Germany, was, on many occasions, in the hands of the nobility, or of the owners of large estates, has of late, in the former country, by the voluntary resignation of many of these, been more

[a] This forms a singular contrast to the privileges and possessions of the Bishops and Clergy of those northern kingdoms before the Reformation, which were then immense. See Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 86, &c.

concentrated in the government, and thereby many abuses have been corrected, and the introduction of unworthy subjects prevented. Every compensation given for a living is considered in the Lutheran Church as simony, and renders him who is guilty of it unfit for the office thus obtained. The public purchase of livings is therefore totally unknown among them, though it cannot be denied, that the complaint of Mosheim,[1] of the irregularities and relaxation of discipline in the Lutheran Church, is probably still more just now than it was at the time he made it. The power of excommunication has, perhaps with great justice, been brought entirely into disrepute, and is very seldom exercised."[2]

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, NUMBERS, &c.—"Lutheranism is the established Creed and form of religion in *Denmark*, *Norway*, and *Sweden*,[3] in a great part of *Germany*, particularly in the north, and in *Saxony*; in *Livonia*, and *Esthonia*, and the greatest part of *Prussia*. There are likewise Lutheran Churches in *Holland*, *Curland*, *Russia*, *Hungary*, *North America*, the *Danish West India Islands*, &c. In *Russia*, the Luthe-

[1] Vol. iv. p. 290—1.

[2] Many readers, on the other hand, will no doubt, with Mosheim, regret this circumstance. See his *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 290, &c.

[3] Zimmerman remarks, that the number of the inferior clergy, comprehending the ministers of parishes, &c., amounts in Sweden only to 1387, and that there are 192 *Provosts* or Presidents. *Polit. Survey*, p. 78.

rans are at present more numerous than any other sect, that of the Greek Christians excepted. In *Poland* are several Lutheran Churches; in Warsaw one since the year 1781. In *Hungary*, the Lutherans have 439 churches and 472 pastors, who are elected by the people, and regulate among themselves their church government In the *French* empire they have, like the Reformed, received, by the concordat with the Pope, a regular establishment and form, consistories and synods; but the government seems desirous to keep a watchful eye over their proceedings; for it is expressly stipulated, that they cannot hold any consultation on ecclesiastical matters without previous notice given to the prefect, and the presence of the prefect or one of his delegates.—They are divided into three consistories general, viz. those of *Strasburg*, *Mentz*, and *Cologne*.

"In these provinces, considerable progress has been made towards a union of the Reformed and Lutherans; many congregations and consistories of these two persuasions have already united of their own accord. The same spirit of accommodation has shewn itself of late in the free imperial city of *Bremen*, where the Reformed have set the example by electing a Lutheran clergyman as minister to one of their principal churches.

"In Holland there were, in the year 1790, forty-one Lutheran congregations, with 53 ordained ministers. The principal Lutheran congregation at *Amsterdam* consisted, during the flourishing time of the Republic, sometimes of 30,000

members, and has five Dutch and one German minister. There are also some professors of the Lutheran doctrine both in Asia and Africa.

"In London are six congregations of Christians professedly Lutheran, viz. *four* German, *one* Swedish, and *one* Danish, besides the Lutheran chapel in the palace of St. James, founded by Prince George of Denmark, at which two German Lutheran clergymen are appointed by his Majesty; who, however, stand under the inspection of the Bishop of London, and use a translation of the form of prayers of the established Church of England."

In 1781 the Emperor of Germany granted to the Lutherans the free exercise of their religion, under certain limitations, throughout his hereditary dominions.

Those of Vienna published, about the same time, a well composed Confession of Faith, to confute misrepresentations of their sentiments.—Their numbers in that city in 1785 amounted to about 2500; and they have been gradually increasing since that time, so that there are in it at present 14 Lutheran congregations, and one Superintendent and Consistory, sanctioned by the government.[1]

In several instances it has happened that the

[1] It is remarkable, that the Republic of Geneva was lately (*i. e.* in 1779) the only government in Switzerland, which permitted the Lutheran religion to be publicly exercised.—Coxe's *Sketches of the State of Switzerland.* London, 1779.

prince has been of one persuasion, and his subjects of another. Thus, the Elector of Saxony is a Roman Catholic, yet almost all his subjects are Lutherans; and both the King of Prussia and the Prince of Hesse and their courts are Calvinists, while most of their subjects also are Lutherans. In Sweden, on the contrary, the Sovereign must profess the religion of his country, and maintain it in the kingdom.

"The Lutherans have too long cherished in their breasts that spirit of intolerance and bigotry, from which they themselves have suffered so long and so much, and this spirit has often impeded among them the progress of science and enlightened enquiry, and frustrated many attempts made by the reformed party towards a re-union. In the free imperial cities of Germany they have been peculiarly intolerant, and have refused, in *Franckfort* on the *Mayn*, till within these few years, to the Reformed, the permission of performing divine worship within the bounds of the city; but this bigotry is at present by no means characteristic in them; and during the last thirty-five or forty years, learning has been cultivated, and liberality of sentiment and doctrine practised by them in at least an equal degree with any other Christian party.

"The Lutheran princes have cherished the sciences with peculiar care. Out of the *eighteen* Protestant Universities, which have hitherto existed in Germany, *fourteen* are Lutheran; and among these *Gottingen*, *Jena*, *Leipzig*, and *Halle*,

are names dear to theological literature.[1] The great attention which has been paid to education, and the improvement of the schools, both higher and lower, has spread a very general knowledge among the people, and learning among the clergy.

"The names of Michaelis, Mosheim, Griesbach, Paulus, Eickhorn, Doederlein, Henke, Herder, and many others, all of them divines of the Lutheran Church, must rescue her, in the opinion of her members, from the reproach of inferiority in learning, as well as from that of bigotry and intolerance."[2]

Miscellaneous Remarks.—By the peace of *Westphalia*, in 1648, which furnished the fundamental laws of the German empire, in an ecclesiastical as well as a civil view, three Christian parties only received perfectly free and equal right of publicly exercising their religion; viz. *the Roman Catholics*, *the Lutherans*, and *the Calvinists*; or, as these last are more commonly called, the *Reformed*.

All others are expressly excluded. In later times, however, as the bonds which united the

[1] Other Lutheran Universities in Germany are *Tubingen*, *Helmstadt*, *Altorf*, &c.

[2] The famous *Swedenborg* is said to have lived and died in the communion of the Lutheran Church.

For an ample account of the chief Lutheran divines, see Melchior Adami *Vitæ Theologorum*, and Dupin's *Bibliotheque des Auteurs separis de la Communion de l'Eglise Romaine, du 16 et du 17 Siecle.* Par. 1718.

many parts of that empire became looser, the different princes have claimed, or at least exercised, the right of extending toleration in their respective dominions, and several other parties have publicly avowed themselves. Yet, still, their number is but very small, and many divisions and subdivisions, existing in this country, are entirely unknown in Germany, which does not afford a great variety with regard to particular parties and separate communities of Christians. Toleration has more generally shewn itself there in suffering a public avowal of a difference of sentiment within the pales of the established Churches, than in the acknowledgment of new parties and denominations. Hence few disputes and rivalships have arisen, and schisms become with every year less frequent. The three established Churches, and particularly, as already observed, (p. 239,) the Lutherans and the Calvinists, have approached each other in many places; the distinctions which had originally separated them, both in doctrine and worship, having begun to disappear.

The influence produced on the external and internal state of the Church, by the changes which Germany has undergone within the last ten years, it is not yet possible correctly to estimate; still less can we conjecture, with any degree of probability, what effects the present state of that unfortunate country will produce in future on the religious principles and conduct of its inhabitants. The apprehension entertained by some of a relapse into the errors of the Roman

Church, are certainly not justified by any circumstances that have hitherto taken place: but it is not unlikely that a far greater variety of sects and parties will appear in future than have yet been known in Germany.

The spirit of enquiry, called forth by the Reformation, has ever since been very active; and if within the last twenty years it now and then degenerated in a propensity to infidelity, it has also produced, within the same period, most valuable and learned investigations in every branch of the sciences connected with religion, and the Germans may still be justly called a religious nation.

By the decree of the imperial diet in 1801, which ordered the secularization of the bishoprics and ecclesiastical bodies, Protestantism appeared to gain the superiority in the empire; but many new changes have since taken place, of which, from the present state of public affairs, we are but very imperfectly informed.

Had it accorded with the plan of this work to give general accounts of countries in a religious view, and had the communication with the Continent been free, I should have obtained many interesting details, and important sources of information, (which at present are not open to me,) through the learned and very respectable Lutheran divine, to whom the reader is indebted for much of the information which I have been enabled to communicate under this article. Inverted commas distinguish most of his remarks,

which are all "founded partly on his own observation and experience, and partly on the most respectable authorities."—He particularly acknowledges his obligations to his friend the pastor of the Danish church in London, and to a work published in 1804, which I have not yet seen, entitled *Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics*, by Dr Staudlin, professor of divinity at *Gottingen*, "who has drawn from the latest authorities, which he carefully quotes."

UNITED CHURCH

OF

ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

NAME.—This church is that established by law in England and Ireland, where it makes part of the common law of the land, or constitution of the country.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—When and by whom Christianity was first introduced into Britain, cannot be exactly ascertained at this distance of time. Eusebius, indeed, positively declares, that it was by the Apostles and their disciples; Bishops Jewell, and Stillingfleet, Dr Cave, and others, insist that it was by *St Paul*; and Baronius affirms, on the authority of an ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, that the Gospel was planted in Britain by *Simon Zelotes* the Apostle, and *Joseph of Arimathea*, and that the latter came over A. D. 35, *i. e.* about the 21st year of Tiberius, and died

nere.[1] If this account be true, the Church of England received Christianity several years before St Peter is said to have visited Rome, which, according to some, was not till the 2d year of Claudius, A. D. 42. "And, for the honour of my mother Church, I speak, that Christianity was first publicly professed by authority in this kingdom, about 130 years before it was in Rome; *Lucius* our king, being (as I read) the first Christian king in Europe, who reigned about the year of our Lord 170. And moreover, Constantine the Christian Emperor was born amongst us, who gave the first public liberty to the Roman Church."[2]

According to Archbishop Usher, the British Churches had a school of learning in the year 182, to provide them with proper teachers; and it would appear, that they flourished, without dependence upon any foreign church, till the arrival of *Austin* in the latter end of the 6th century.

Episcopacy was early established in this country; and it ought to be remembered, to the honour of the British Bishops and Clergy, that they withstood the encroachments of the see of Rome for several centuries; on which account, their piety hath been but meanly regarded by some zealous Roman Catholics.—Popery, however, was introduced into England, according to some, by *Aus-*

[1] Bishop Jewell's *Works*, p. 11. Bishop Stillingfleet's *Origines Britan.* p. 35, 48, &c. MS. *Vatican. Baron.* ad ann. Christi 35.

[2] Dr Pagitt's *Christianography*, p. 147.

tin the *Monk*;[1] and we find its errors every where prevalent for several ages preceding the Reformation, until Wickliff was raised up in the 14th century to refute them.[2] The seed which he had sown took root downwards, and sprang upwards during his life, and ripened after his death, into a glorious harvest. But it was not until the reign of Henry the VIII. that the Reformation is usually said to have begun in England.—When Luther declared war against the Pope, then Leo the X., this prince, proud of his theological might, rushed into the battle; and his treatise on the Seven Sacraments against Luther's book *Of the Captivity of Babylon*, was repaid by the enraptured pontiff with praise little inferior to that of inspiration, and with the title of *Defender of the*

[1] *Augustine* or *Austin* the *Monk*, was sent from Rome about the year 596, to convert the Saxons, and was the first Archbishop of Canterbury.

[2] He was born at *Wickliffe*, near Richmond in Yorkshire, about 1324, and studied at *Queen's*, (afterwards at *Merton*) College, *Oxford*, where he was some time Divinity Professor. He maintained many Protestant tenets, wrote several tracts against the principal doctrines of Popery, and was the first who translated the whole Bible into English. Such was his courage and zeal, that he is said to have sent a confession of his faith to the Pope, and to have declared himself willing to defend it at Rome. He was many years minister at *Lutterworth* in Leicestershire, where, notwithstanding the danger to which his zeal exposed him, he quietly ended his days, A. D. 1384, or, according to others, in 1387.

For some account of him and his doctrines, see Gilpin's *Lives*, or the 1st part of the 4th vol. of Mr Milner's *Hist. of the Ch. of Christ.*

Faith, which, in a sense diametrically opposite, and by a claim of higher desert, was regularly handed down together with his crown, and now belongs to his successor. But Henry was faithful in allegiance only to his passions. He soon felt scruples, encreased by his growing attachment to Ann Boleyn, as to the lawfulness of his marriage with Catharine of Arragon, who had originally been contracted to his brother; and he solicited the Pope for a divorce. His Holiness procrastinated a decision for the space of six years, when Archbishop Cranmer dissolved the king's marriage, by a sentence pronounced in May 1533, without waiting for the sentence of the court of Rome. On this, Clement the VII. then Pope, threatened, and at last pronounced excommunication against Henry for not taking back his queen; which proved fatal to the interests of his Holiness, for the king now threw off all restraint, renounced the Papal Supremacy, and openly separated from the see of Rome. He was however no Protestant at heart, but firmly attached to the doctrines which he had formerly defended; and notwithstanding this, he took the government of Ecclesiastical affairs into his own hand, and plundered the monasteries. And with the assistance of Archbishop Cranmer, who, by his writings and influence contributed more perhaps than any other person towards the Reformation in England, having reformed several abuses, he was himself de-

clared by parliament, *Supreme Head of the Church.*[1]

On the death of Henry, the Reformation began to advance in earnest during the short reign of his successor Edward the VI.—But when Mary ascended the throne, all was reversed. Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and Ferrar, Dr Taylor, Messrs Rogers, Bradford, Philpot, and other eminent Protestants, with numbers of their followers, sealed their faith with their blood; while Switzerland, Germany, and the Low Countries, swarmed with English exiles, who fled for their lives.[2]

The death of Mary made way for the accession of Queen Elizabeth, who soon dispelled this storm, and established the Protestant religion throughout her dominions. She declared herself head of the Church, assumed the title of Supreme governor thereof within her kingdom, both in Spirituals and Temporals, and set the Church of England on the same footing, on which it was under Edward the VI. and on which it now stands.

[1] It is worthy of remark here, that the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy was now only *restored*; for it seems to have been frequently asserted long before the Reformation, particularly by the famous Statute of *Premunire*, 16 Richard II.

[2] The whole number burnt in this reign was (as Bishop Burnet moderately reckons them) 284. But Archbishop Grindal, who lived at the same time, says, they were 800. Besides these, 60 died in prisons. Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, B. 3. A. D. 1558.

With respect to the church of Ireland, in the course of these changes, she followed the steps and the fortunes of that in the then sister kingdom.

The Church of England had the discretion to observe some decency and moderation in the business of reforming; and withdrew not from the original platform of the Catholic faith, but from the innovations of modern corruption. "Inter vel excessu vel defectu peccantes mediam viam secuta," she rejected such docrines only as were not to be found in the revealed will of God, or that had not been universally received; and such discipline as was not regularly derived from the authority of the apostles. Her reformers disclaimed every leader but Christ, with the exclusive veneration of the primitive faith; listening to those that preceded them in the glorious work, not as dictators of their creed, but as monitors and guides. Restraining the ardour of innovation, their judgment was equally conspicuous both in expunging from the Protestant ritual a long train of unedifying ceremonies, and in retaining the most decorous usages of worship, together with as many of the more important usages and ceremonies of the Church, as were innocent and conducive to order and decency, and whatever was venerable in ecclesiastical antiquity.[1]

But no sooner had the Church separated from

[1] See the rule which the Reformers laid down to change nothing for novelty's sake, in Burnet's *Hist. of the Reform.* vol. ii. p. 73.—See also an excellent account and vindication of the

the see of Rome, than many of her members began to separate from her, on pretence that she retained too much, and did not proceed far enough in the work of reformation.[1] These first dissenters were styled *Puritans*, from their desiring a purer form of worship and discipline, than had yet been established. But other sects and parties soon broke off, under various names, and on various pretences, whereby the Church underwent many fluctuations; and during the *Interregnum*, when her establishment was suppressed, the public profession of religion branched out into the most fanciful appearances. Every man preached that which was right in his own eyes; "and it was then a most signal mark of a saint," says Dr Nicholls, "to be the author of some monstrous opinion."

At the Restoration, the Church was restored to her former state and privileges;—at the Revolution, the established religion was acknowledged,

proceedings of the Church of England in this respect in Hooker's *Eccl. Pol.* B. 4. C. 14,

"Nos quidem," says Bishop Jewell, "uti diximus de mutanda religione nihil temere aut insolenter, nihil nisi cunctanter, et magna cum deliberatione fecimus," &c.

Apology, p. 155. See also his *Epist. De Concil. Trident.* § 32.

[1] According to some, the foundation of this schism was laid during their state of exile at *Frankfort*, in the former reign, where some of them were for confining themselves to the use of the forms, as they had been established at home, and others were for improving their liberty to the utmost, in reforming whatever they thought exceptionable.

and placed on a firm and permanent foundation; and in 1800, when the kingdoms of Britain and Ireland were united, the Churches of England and Ireland, which had always been the same in government, faith, and worship, became one *United Church*.

DISTINGUISHING TENETS.—The acknowledged standards of the faith and doctrines of the *United Church* are, after the Scriptures, the *Book of Homilies*, and her 39 *Articles* which are to be found in most *Common Prayer Books*. Her Liturgy also may be mentioned under this head; for it is doctrinal as well as devotional, and informs the judgment, while it kindles the affections.

The Homilies were composed by *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, and *Ridley*, men of unexceptionable learning and orthodoxy; or, according to others, the first book was written principally by *Cranmer*, and the second by *Jewell*; and they were, with great wisdom, appointed by the governors of the Church to be read in Churches at the beginning of the Reformation, when, by reason of the scarcity of learned divines, few ministers were found, who could safely be trusted to preach their own compositions.

The first draught of the Articles was drawn by Archbishop Cranmer, assisted by Bishop Ridley, in the year 1551; and after being corrected by the other Bishops, and approved of by convocation, they were published in Latin and English, 42 in number, in 1553.

In 1562, they were revised and corrected; and being then reduced to 39,[1] were first emitted in Latin only, and there was no authentic English copy of them till 1571, when they were again reviewed by the Convocation, brought to their present form, and published authoritatively both in Latin and English; and they were ratified last of all in the reign of Charles I. Unfortunately the authenticated original copy of them was burnt in the great fire of London. The most authentic manuscript copy of them now extant belonged to Archbishop Parker, and may be seen in the Library of *Corpus Christi College*, Cambridge, having been left by him to that College.[2]

Archbishop Usher drew up a set of articles for the Church of Ireland, which were agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin, A. D. 1615; but in 1634, Archbishop Laud had influence to get the 39 articles accepted there, which still continue to be likewise the

[1] The four Articles of Edward's Code, which were omitted from the Articles confirmed in Convocation in 1562, related to the *Resurrection of the Dead*; the *Unperishable Nature of the Soul*; the *Millenarian Heretics*, and *Universal Salvation*.

[2] Broughton's *Histor. Library*, vol. i. p. 84.

On the other hand, we are told by the Critical Reviewers, that "the orginal MS. of the Articles, with the subscriptions of the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, and the Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation, may be seen in the Library of *Bennet College*, Cambridge." *Crit. Rev.* for June 1808, p. 179. I should be happy to see these accounts reconciled.

standard of the doctrines of that part of the now United Church.—The Church requires a subscription to these Articles of all who are to be admitted members of any of the Universities, and of all who are admitted into Holy Orders, or to Ecclesiastical Benefices.[1]

In the course of the last century, disputes arose among the Clergy, respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulary of religious sentiments; and an application for its removal was made to parliament in 1772, by certain Clergymen and others, which received the most public discussion, but was rejected by a large majority, (219 against 73.)[2]

It has generally been held by most, if not all, Calvinists, both in and out of the Church, that the determination of the Synod of Dort upon the famous *Quinquarticular* controversy, is the doctrinal system of the Church of England, or, in other words, that her doctrinal Articles are Calvinistical. This opinion however has been warmly controverted by others, and never did the dispute run higher on this subject than it has done of late years, especially between Mr Overton of York on the one side, and Dr Kipling, Dean of Peter-

[1] This holds good in England only; for "in Ireland it is not necessary, either at ordination, institution, or taking degrees in Colleges, to subscribe the 39 Articles, or any of them." Browne's *Eccles. Law*, vol. ii. p. 244. note.

[2] See a Copy of the Petition signed by about 250 of the Clergy and certain members of the two professions of Law and Physic, and some others, in Brewster's *Secular Essay*, p. 250, &c.

borough, and Mr Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum, on the other;[1] and each party seem to understand the Articles exclusively in their own sense. But as some of our reformers were inclined to Calvinism, and others to Arminianism, it is perhaps more natural to believe, with some of our ablest divines,[2] that the Articles are framed with comprehensive latitude, and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was meant to be exclusively established. No.—To the Church of England is "*sua opinio, suus honor.*" Properly speaking, (if an obscure individual might presume to speak on so delicate a subject) she is not in her doctrines, any more than in her discipline, Calvinistic, Arminian, Lutheran, or Romish; but, combining the perfections of all those persuasions, and avoiding their faults and defects, she stands as distinguished in a religious view, as the state, to which she is allied, does in a political one.[3]

To adopt the language of Mr Faber, in his

[1] Mr O. in his *True Churchman Ascertained*, takes the Calvinistic side, and the other is warmly supported by Dr K. in his *Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistic*, and by Mr D. in his *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

[2] Bishop Burnet, Dr Waterland, &c.

See also Mr Gray's *Bampton Lect.* p. 265. Note.

[3] "Our Church is not Lutheran, it is not Calvinistic, it is not Arminian, it is Scriptural.—It is built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner Stone."

Bishop Pretyman's *Charge* for 1803, p. 23.

Thoughts on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy, to which the reader is referred;—"To the Calvinist the Articles declare the doctrine of *Universal Redemption*;—to the Pelagian they assert the existence of *Original Sin*; to the Antinomian they declare that good works are a *sine qua non* of Salvation, though not the meritorious cause of it;—to the Latitudinarian they avow, that they are to be had accursed who presume to say that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature;—while they teach the Romanist, that we are accounted righteous before God, *only* for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and neither for *our own* works or deservings, nor for the supererogatory works of *Saints*."

It is always to be lamented when private animosities obstruct the discharge of public duties; nor can the flock prosper while the shepherds are at variance. The church, whether Catholic or National, must continue to receive her members, distinguished by the diversities of human character; and that perfect agreement of opinion, which can result only from perfect knowledge, it were fruitless on earth to expect. The vesture of Christ's Church, or of any sound branch of the Church, may still exhibit its variegated colours, if, like his own, having no seam, it be not *rent*. And one of the parties in this controversy, as if assuming the character of an umpire, has well

observed that—"the peculiarities of Calvinism do not belong to the essence of Christianity;—they are not necessary Catholic verities, but merely matters of opinion, in which a man may err, or be ignorant, without danger to his soul."—"In the number of those who have held them, and those who have held them not, are to be found some of the most spiritual members of the church. Calvinism, therefore, may be considered as containing opinions, with respect to which the best of Christians may be allowed to differ without any forfeiture of their Christian character, provided they break not the bond of charity in so doing."—"Why may not our hearts be united though our heads do differ? and, above all, why do we not as Christians forbear all capital censures either way; which must needs involve many holy souls, many Catholic bishops of the ancient church, many learned and godly doctors of our own; all of whom have differed in their opinions on these points, at the same time that they have been closely united in their affections?"[1]

Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies.—In this Church divine service is conducted by a Liturgy, entitled, *The Book of Common Prayer and*

[1] Mr Daubeny's *Introductory Chap.* to his *Vindiciæ Eccles. Angl.* P. 12. 13.

"Alia sunt in quibus inter se aliquando etiam doctissimi atque optimi regulæ Catholicæ doctores salvâ fidei compage non consonant."—August. *C. Jul.* 1. 2. p. 8.

Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England.

Before the arrival of Austin in Britain, the Church of England used the pure Liturgy of the Old Gallican Church; and until the Reformation, her Liturgy was only in Latin: but when ion, in ighth's time, was e to a m ething was done tter edification of people. l Liturgy may be d to have year 1537, when ry VIII. nvocation to set th the er. Maria, the Creed, the Ten Comm the Seven Sacraments in the t it was not completed in any degree before the year 1547, the 2d year of King Edward the Sixth, when the first Book of Common Prayer was drawn up and composed from the *King's Primer*, and other former rituals, by Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, together with eleven other eminent divines. It was revised and altered in 1551, when it was again confirmed by Parliament; but both this and the former act, made in 1548, were repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, as "not being agreeable to the Romish superstition, which she was resolved to restore."

But upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the act of repeal was reversed; and the second Book of King Edward, with several alterations,

re-established.[1] In this state the Liturgy continued, till the first year of King James I., when it underwent another review; and the next and last revisal, in which any alteration was made in it by public authority, took place in 1661, the 13th of Charles II.[2]

Many applications have been since made for a review, and particular alterations were proposed in 1689, by several eminent and excellent divines,[3] acting under a commission of government issued for that purpose, in conformity with the articles transmitted to Convocation by Archbishop Sancroft, and the advice of Dr Tillotson. The ten bishops and twenty other divines, who prepared a draft of the work, agreed in twenty points, some of which at least deserved regard; but the purpose of the commission at that time, and also some subsequent attempts, entirely failed.

To this Liturgy every clergyman promises in

[1] This second Prayer Book of Edward VI. had never, I believe, any ecclesiastical authority to support it till the revision of the work under Charles II., but, during that period, subsisted on authority purely regal and parliamentary.

[2] A clear and neat account of the progressive formation of the present Liturgy, from the *Primer* of Henry VIII. to this last revision of Charles II. may be seen in the Introduction to Mr Shepherd's *Critical and Practical Elucidation of the Morning and Evening Prayer*.—See also concerning it Mr Wheatley's excellent *Illustration* of it, and Strype's *Memor.* vol. ii. p. 85.

[3] Archbishops Tillotson and Tennison, and Bishops Patrick, Burnet, Stillingfleet, Kidder, &c.

writing at his ordination to conform in his public ministrations; and so doing, whatever may be the nature of his preaching, which is only a secondary consideration in the public services of the Church, it must be acknowledged, our enemies themselves being judges, that the Liturgy of the Church of England abounds so much with the soundest doctrines of the Gospel, that every devout supplicant, bearing a part in her solemn services, may read his duty, and the motives of his duty, in his truly evangelical petitions. It recognizes with precision the One Great Object of Divine Worship, in his personal distinctions, and glorious attributes;—the honours and offices of the Redeemer;—the power and agency of the Holy Spirit;—the depravity of man;—the evil and danger of sin; and all the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. And as to the composition, it may be questioned if any thing in the English language, our version of the Bible excepted, is worthy of being compared with it, for simplicity, perspicuity, energy, and comprehensive fullness of expression. In the opinion of the impartial and most excellent Grotius, who was no member of this Church, nor lay under any obligation to her, "the English Liturgy comes so near the primitive pattern, that none of the reformed Churches can compare with it."[1]—It was also thought highly

[1] See Mr Wheatley's Appendix to his Introductory Discourse concerning the Book of Common Prayer, and Dr Comber's Character of the Liturgy of the Church of England.

of by Mr Ostervald, by whose care, Dr Nicholls tells us, it was introduced into some churches on the continent.[1]

In *praising* God the United Church employs instrumental as well as vocal music,[2] and the approved version of the Psalms, now in use, is that of Tate and Brady. Among her festivals, which are but few in number, Christmas-day, Easter-day, and Whitsunday, are the most distinguished. She keeps but one Lent in the year, of forty days, and of these Good Friday in particular is observed as a fast.

In *prayer* kneeling is practised, that being the most humble posture, and in *praise* the people stand, to bespeak the elevation of their minds.

The ceremonies of the Church are so harmless, that most of the Christian world agree, or would have no objection to agree, in them. They "are few and easy, ancient and significant, and though we do not place so much religion in externals as the Church of Rome doth, yet here is prescribed all that is needful for decency and order; viz. that the clergy always wear grave and distinct habits, and have peculiar garments in divine administrations,—that churches be adorned and neat,—that the people be reverent in God's house,

[1] *Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England*, p. 141.—See also Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. vi. p. 219.

[2] Instrumental music, however, is not expressly enjoined by her, but only permitted and approved.

—that the memory of our Saviour's chief acts, and the festivals of the Holy Apostles be religiously observed,—that *Lent*, with the vigils of great feasts, the *Ember* weeks, and all the Fridays in the year, be kept as days of fasting or abstinence; and if some Protestants do not observe them, yet others do, and are commended for it,"[1] &c.

She has laid aside the sign of the Cross in Confirmation, together with the *Oblatory* prayer, and the prayer of *Invocation*, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, all which the Episcopal Church in Scotland retains; and the two last are also adopted by the Episcopal Church in America.

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.—The great object of the English reformers was to retain the body and constitution of the primitive Church, and to discard only such tenets and superstitions as had been introduced by mere human authority, subsequent to the apostolic times. They, therefore, retained the primitive Episcopal form of church government, by bishops, priests, and deacons; and this is the only reformed church which retains the episcopal form in its former splendour: for though bishops may also be found in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, &c. they are rather inspectors of the conduct of the clergy and of the

[1] Dr Comber's *Advice to the Roman Catholics of England*, p. 140.

modes of education, than prelates endowed with senatorial rank and dignity.[1]

The sovereigns of England, ever since the reign of Henry VIII., have been styled the "*Supreme Heads of the Church*," as well as "*Defenders of the Faith*;" but this title conveys no spiritual meaning, as it only denotes the regal power to prevent any ecclesiastical differences; or, in other words, it only substitutes the king in place of the pope, before the Reformation, with regard to temporalities, and the external economy of the Church. The kings of England never intermeddle in ecclesiastical disputes, unless by preventing the convocation,[2] when necessary, from sitting to agitate them; and are contented to give a sanction to the legal rights of the clergy, and with the claim of nomination to all vacant bishop-

[1] I would not here be understood as meaning that rank and dignity, or emolument, or any thing external and merely temporal, can add to the *essence* of the Episcopal character; for as the function of a bishop chiefly consists in a commission derived from the Apostles to continue the succession of its own, and the inferior orders of ministers in the Church, and to exercise jurisdiction over those orders, as well as over the people committed to their charge, it is compatible with ranks and habits of life extremely remote from each other, and may subsist alike "in the person of a German prince, an English baron, a Syrian slave, or a Gallilean fisherman."

[2] *The convocation* which the king has the power of convoking and dissolving, is the Ecclesiastical Parliament, by which the Church was formerly governed, but which has not been allowed to meet for business since the year 1717.

rics, except to that of Sodor and Man, which is in the gift of the Duke of Athol.

"Our king hath the same power that the religious kings of Judah had; the same which the great Constantine, and the succeeding emperors, for many years enjoyed; the same power which the ancient kings of this nation exercised, viz. —A power to convene his clergy, and advise with them about affairs of the Church; a power to ratify that which the bishops and clergy agree upon, and give it the force of a law; a power to choose fit persons to govern the Church; a power to correct all offenders against faith or manners, be they clergy or laymen; and finally, a power to determine all causes and controversies, ecclesiastical and civil, among his own subjects, (by the advice of fit counsellors), so as there lies no appeal from his determination; and this is what we mean when we call him *Supreme Governor of this Church*, which our king must needs be, or else he cannot keep his kingdoms in peace."[1]

[1] Dr Comber's *Advice to the Roman Catholics of England*, p. 136, 7.—To the words of the Act 26th Henry VIII. cap. 1. defining the power of the king as supreme head of the Church, the Dissenters, in their Catechism, p. 31. add, that "the appointing of bishops also is his prerogative, and the power of ordination is derived from him, and held during his pleasure." But they surely cannot mean by this awkward expression, that the king is the fountain of ordination, or that he takes upon him to ordain; or even that he can deprive the bishops of the power of ordination, or of any part of their purely spiritual authority. If they do, they so far mislead their catechumens. The doctrine of the king's supremacy is quite distinct from such

The Church of England, with this description of the monarchical power over it, is governed by *two* Archbishops, and *twenty-four* Bishops, exclusive of the Bishop of Sodor and Man. The two ecclesiastical provinces into which England, including Wales, is divided, and over which the two Archbishops preside, are those of Canterbury and York. The province of York, besides its own diocese, contains only those of Durham, Carlisle, Chester, and the Isle of Man. The Archbishops are both dignified with the address of *Your Grace*, and are styled *Most Reverend*. They are appointed by the king in the same manner as the Bishops, by what is called *a Conge d'Elire*, or leave to the Dean and Chapter to elect.[1] His Grace of Canterbury is metropolitan, or primate of *all* England, first peer of the realm, and the next to the royal family; having precedence of all dukes, and all great officers of the crown. It is his privilege,

powers, which were never claimed or pretended to by any king or queen of England.

On the contrary, that the Episcopal character is not derived from, or alienable by, the civil power, is a doctrine well known in England as well as in Scotland; for when Dr Parker was consecrated archbishop, upon a question of the competency of the bishops to consecrate, as they had been legally deprived in the late reign, it was determined, that as they had been once consecrated, the Episcopal character remained, and they might convey it. See Neal, Vol. i. chap. iv.; see also Bishop Jewell's *View of a Seditious Bull*, p. 14. can. 39. and Mr Gray's *Bampt. Lect.* passim.

[1] The Dean (*Decanus*) is so called from his presiding over *ten*, originally the usual number of the Chapter, who, together with him, are, in England, the nominal electors of the Bishop.

by long custom, to crown the kings and queens; and he may hold ecclesiastical courts upon all affairs, which were formerly cognizable in the court of Rome, when not repugnant to the law of God, or the king's prerogative. He has the power of probate of all testaments within his province, and of granting several dispensations concerning benefices, marriage, &c. In other respects, the archiepiscopal office is rather a dignity than a jurisdiction; and the primates have rarely interfered of late in any dioceses except their own. [1]

His Grace the Archbishop of York, is styled Primate of England, and has precedence of all dukes not of the royal blood, and of all officers of state except the Lord High Chancellor. The Bishops are addressed by the appellation of *Your Lordships*, and styled, *Right Reverend Fathers in God.* Their benefices were converted by William the Conqueror into temporal baronies, so that they are all, except the Bishop of Man, [2] Barons, or Lords of parliament, and one of the three estates of the

[1] "I cannot here omit a just tribute to the English government, particularly since the Reformation. The chair of Canterbury has been, without an exception, given to merit, with so little regard to great connections, that during two centuries, I recollect but one man of noble birth who has sat in it." Browne's *Eccles. Law*, Vol. ii. p. 208. note.

[2] There is a seat for the Bishop of Man, detached from the other Bishops, and within the bar of the House of Lords, but he has no vote. Were the island, however, as in the case of treason, to become forfeit to the crown, the Bishop, as holding his barony from the king, would then have a vote as well as a seat. Bishop Levinz sat there in his episcopal robes.

realm, and as such sit and vote in the House of Lords, where they represent the clergy. They take precedence of all temporal barons, and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, take the precedence of the other Bishops, who rank after them according to their seniority of consecration.

Their office is to govern their respective dioceses, to assist at the consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, (for which purpose three are required,)[1] to examine and ordain priests and deacons, to consecrate churches and burying grounds, and to administer the rite of confirmation, which they generally do at the triennial visitation of their dioceses.[2] Their privileges approach the regal; for they are sole judges in their own courts, and issue writs in their own names, not in the royal style used by other courts. Their jurisdiction still embraces several particulars respecting temporalities; but they now, indeed, confine their attention to the clergy, and seldom, except in parliament, interfere in secular subjects. The see of Durham constitutes a county palatine, and the Bishop has great powers and prerogatives; even the king's judges sit in his diocese only by his permission.

A person must be twenty-three years of age,

[1] There is, however, no necessity, except what proceeds from canon law, for more than *one* ordainer; so that *two* or *three* are required, not to make the consecration valid, but canonical.

[2] In Ireland, the Bishops visit their dioceses annually, archidiaconal visitations being there unknown.

before he can be ordained deacon, or have any share in the ministry; a deacon must be fully twenty-four before he can be ordained priest, and by that means, be empowered to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or hold any benefice, or cure of souls; and a priest must be at least thirty years of age before he can be consecrated bishop.

In the ordination of priests, but not of deacons, the bishop is assisted by priests at the imposition of hands; but this is done only as a mark of assent, not because it is thought necessary, or essential to the due ordination.

At the several ordinations of a deacon and a priest, the candidate submits himself to the examination of the bishop, as to his proficiency in learning; he gives the proper security of his soundness in the faith by the subscriptions which are made previously necessary; he is required to bring testimonials of his virtuous conversation during the three preceding years; and that no mode of enquiry may be omitted, public notice of his offering himself to be ordained is given in the parish church where he resides or ministers, and the people are solemnly called upon to declare, if they know any impediment for the which he ought not to be admitted. At the time of ordination, also, the same solemn call is made on the congregation then present.

Examinations, subscriptions, and testimonials, are not repeated at the consecration of a bishop, because the person to be consecrated has added

to the securities given at his former ordinations, that sanction which arises from his having constantly lived and exercised his ministry under the eyes and observation of his country. But no person can be consecrated to the office of a bishop, without the king's licence for his election to that office, and the royal mandate, under the great seal, for his confirmation and consecration; and he is likewise required to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and also the oath of due obedience to the Archbishop of his province.

The Bishop's representatives and assistants in the government of the Church are the archdeacons, of whom there are 60 in England. Their office is to hold visitations of the clergy in their respective portions of the diocese once every year, when the Bishop does not himself visit, when they enquire into the reparations and moveables belonging to churches, reform slight abuses, suspend, excommunicate, &c. The other dignitaries of the Church are the deans, prebendaries, canons, &c.; and the inferior clergy are the rectors, vicars, and curates.—The United Church knows but three orders of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons; but the word *order* sometimes denotes not only a spiritual power or degree in the Church, but also a rank or degree in the frame or constitution of ecclesiastical polity. In this last sense, she has several orders, of which the most remarkable are archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, rectors, vicars, and curates.

The rector enjoys the prædial, or *great* tithes of

the parish; but if these be appropriated, or converted into secular hands, the priest is termed a *vicar*, a name originally implying that he was the *vicarius*, or deputy of the rector. The vicar has only the *small* tithes of his parish; and hence rectories are generally much preferable to vicarages in point of emolument.[1] In England, the magistracy is not deemed incompatible with the clerical office, and it is very usual for clergymen in the country to act as justices of the peace; but a late act of parliament declares persons in holy orders ineligible to seats in parliament.

In the government of their respective parishes, the clergy are assisted by the Church wardens, who, one or two in number, are generally chosen every year in Easter week, from the most respectable of the parishioners, and who might do great service to the cause of religion, were they conscientiously to discharge the important office with which they are intrusted.[2]

The other branch of the United Church, I

[1] Tithes are divided into *prædial*, as of corn, grass, hops, and wood;—*Mixed*, as of wool, milk, pigs, natural productions, but nurtured by the care of man;—and *personal*, as of manual occupations, fisheries, &c. &c.

A more usual division is into *great*, as corn, hay, and wood; and *small*, as prædial tithes of other kinds, and those called personal, or mixed. But the clergy in general do not now take their tithes in kind, but accept a commutation, or piece of money.

[2] See Dean Prideaux's *Directions to Church Wardens*, 12mo. 1723, or Newton's *Whole Duty of Parish Officers*, 8vo. 1792. See also below, p. 385.

mean the *Church of Ireland*, is likewise Episcopal, and is governed by four archbishops, viz. those of *Armagh*, *Dublin*, *Cashel*, and *Tuam*, and *eighteen* suffragan bishops.[1] Since the union of Britain and Ireland, one archbishop and three bishops sit in the House of Peers alternately, by rotation of sessions; a mode of representation, which, it is the opinion of some, that parliament, in its wisdom, will no doubt soon see reason to change.[2]

The nature of the discipline of the Church may be seen in her Canons, entitled "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation, &c. and agreed upon with the King's Majesty's licence, in their Synod, begun at London, A. D. 1603," in the first year of King James I. These canons, in number 141, were a collection out of the several preceding canons and injunctions, and are all founded in the canons of ancient councils; and "being authorized by the king's commission, according to the form of the statute of the 25th of Henry VIII., they were warranted by act of parliament, and became part of the law of the

[1] Cities, and bishops sees are not necessarily connected in Ireland, as in England.

[2] *Trinity College, Dublin*, is the only University in Ireland, and graduates of that College are admitted *ad eundem*, in Oxford and Cambridge, and *vice versa*. But before the union of the Churches by the Irish Stat. 17 and 18 Ch. II. Chap. 2. no person could hold ecclesiastical dignity or benefice in England and Ireland at the same time; and the same law, I believe, is still in force.

land, and as binding in *Ecclesiastical* matters, as any statute whatever in civil." [1]

In the reign of Charles I. several canons (drawn up, I believe, by Archbishop Laud,) were passed by the clergy in Convocation, and approved by the king and privy council; but after the Restoration, when the bishops were restored, by an act of parliament, to their jurisdiction, there was a proviso in the act, that it should not confirm the canons made in 1640: and thus the Ecclesiastical laws were left as they were laid down in the canons of 1603.

From a careful examination of these canons, it will no doubt be found that the discipline of the Church, however much relaxed in these our days, is neither partial, nor defective, and that if there be any fraud or neglect in the execution, it is owing, not to the want of good laws, but to the corruption and knavery of mankind, which prevail more or less in all nations, notwithstanding the best laws that can be made to prevent it.

The offences of fornication, adultery, incest, &c. are cognizable in the ecclesiastical court. For the commission of either of these, the of-

[1] Broughton's *Histor. Library*, vol. i. p. 199. If Mr B. means, by this expression, that the canons were *confirmed by act of parliament*, he leads his reader into a mistake; for Judge Blackstone remarks in his Introduction, that the canons of James I. "*as not confirmed by parliament*," have been declared to be not obligatory to the laity, except where they are explanatory of the ancient canon law, whatever respect they are entitled to from the clergy.—See also the *Preface* to Mr Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, vol. ii. p. 27. edit. 1723.

fender may be prosecuted in the ecclesiastical court of the diocese in which he resides, at the instance of the church wardens, who are bound by their oath, to return the names of all loose and scandalous livers, into the bishop's court, once a year; (or twice if the custom of the place require it,) and at any other time, if they please, they may present for gross crimes. And if the minister observes that the church wardens neglect their duty out of fear or slothfulness, and that no voluntary promoter appears, then the canons empower him to take the business of prosecuting offenders into his own hands. If the party accused be convicted of the crime, upon the testimony of two witnesses at least, before the judge in the ecclesiastical court, he may be excommunicated, and not admitted to the sacrament, or any communion in divine offices, and be condemned in the costs of the suit.

Crimes of a very heinous nature, are punished with the *greater* excommunication, whereby the offender is cut off from commerce with Christians, even in *temporal* affairs; and, if the excommunicated person obstinately persist, for forty days, to disobey the sentence of the ecclesiastical judge, he may be sent to prison, by virtue of the writ "*de excommunicato capiendo*," where he is to continue till he makes satisfaction for his offence by *penance* and humble submission.[1]

[1] See the Form of Public Penance in Dr Nicholl's *Defence*, pp. 324-5. See also Burn's *Eccles. Law*.

Excommunication, to have a civil effect, must be pronoun-

Whence it must appear, that the *United Church of England and Ireland* is the true mean between superstition and fanaticism. Her doctrine is entirely built upon the prophets and apostles, and therefore evangelical; her government is truly apostolical; her Liturgy is an extract from the best primitive forms; her ceremonies are few, and such as tend only to decency and true devotion;[1] and her sacred edifices, whilst they are divested of the gawdy decorations, and puerile ornaments of popery, are furnished with those appendages which give dignity to public worship, and distinguish the functions of its ministers from ordinary occupations. Well then might Dr Chandler (an eminent dissenter) be "a warm advocate for the constitution of the Church of England, in preference to any of the reformed churches."[2] And I close this head with the

ced by the bishop, and signified by him to Chancery, whence the writ *De excommunicato capiendo* is issued to the sheriff, to imprison the party without bail or main prize, till he hath made satisfaction to the church. If a *non inventus* is retained, a *capias* is to be awarded, with a proclamation for appearance within six days, on pain of pecuniary fines, with increasing weight.

[1] See an able defence of those rites, ceremonies, and offices of the church to which the Puritans objected, in the third book of Hooker's *Eccles. Polity*.

[2] Bishop Horsley's Letters to Dr Priestley, p. 161.

Yet, according to Dr Priestley, this church is farther from the standard of the gospel than any sect or denomination among us. (See above, p. 177.) It would have been difficult, perhaps, for Dr Priestley to have paid the Church of England any other compliment which her members could have more readily or heartily returned.

good wish of another distinguished presbyterian—"Let her enjoy that singular blessing of God, which I wish may be ever continued to her."[1]

COUNTRIES WHERE FOUND, &c.—The religion of the United Church is established in all his Majesty's dominions abroad, *Canada* excepted, where the Roman Catholic religion, having been the establishment before the country was ceded to us by the French, still continues to be so. There is, notwithstanding, a Protestant bishop in Canada, and another in Nova Scotia; both of whom, together with their clergy, are paid by Government. No bishop has yet been sent out to the West or East Indies; the clergy there are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, as were also those of America, so long as the American provinces made a part of the British empire.

The number of inhabitants in England and Wales is supposed to be about 8,000,000; and of these one-fifth, or more, are said to dissent from the established religion. The number of parishes is nearly 10,000,[2] and the church livings are in the gift of the king, the bishops, the two universities,

[1] "Fruatur sane istâ singulari Dei beneficentiâ, quæ utinam sit illi perpetua."

Beza, when speaking of the constitution of the Church of England, in his *Tract. de Minist. Eccles. Grad.*

[2] But the livings of all descriptions amount to about 11,755, viz.—Rectories, 5,098; vicarages, 3,687; livings of other descriptions, 2,970.

and the cathedrals, the nobility, gentry, &c.[1] The revenues of the church are considered by some as very considerable; but, according to the great Lord Chatham, they are "but a pittance." The present income of the sees, and livings, and of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, (which are the nurseries of the church,) are supposed to amount to nearly 3,000,000l. per annum; and this arises chiefly from the tythes, the value of which increases with the improvement of lands. The number of the established clergy, of all ranks and orders, is about 18,000. They do not form a distinct body from their fellow subjects; they are amenable to the same laws; they pay the same contribution to taxes, and

[1] Almost 1000 are in the gift of the king. It is customary, however, for the Lord Chancellor to present to all the livings under the value of 20l. in the king's book, which are about 780; and for the other ministers of state to present to all the rest. Upwards of 1600 pieces of church preferment, great and small, are in the gift of the bishops; more than 600 in the presentation of the two Universities; about 1000 in the gift of the several cathedrals and other clerical institutions; about 5700 are in the nomination of the nobility and gentry; and 50 or 60 may be of a description different from any of these.

All the livings of 10l. and 20l. in the king's book, have been augmented by Queen Anne's bounty, which began to be distributed in 1714. It is about 13,000l. per annum, clear of deductions. Bishop Burnet made the application for it. The money arises from the first fruits and tenths of church livings, above a certain value, which, before the reign of Henry VIII., used to go to the Pope.—See *An Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England.*

they suffer the same punishment for crimes.[1] The property which they possess as clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, is the salary of an office, and the succession to it is open to any family in the kingdom.

In Ireland, the members of the established church are said to amount only to about 300,000, and the whole body of the clergy not to exceed 1200;[2] and neither there nor in England, it is feared, is the church recovering the members which she has lost. Instead of seeing the prodigal returning to his *mother's* house, to be fed there at a table rich and well furnished with all the viands of the gospel, and where preside men duly qualified and authorized to minister in holy things, we daily behold fresh parties breaking off from home, and seemingly preferring those husks that are thrown before them by every illiterate mechanic, who may be pleased to present himself as their spiritual father and instructor.

And we are told, that in Ireland, the followers of Mr Wesley have adopted of late a *new* mode of itinerant preaching: "Their missionaries frequent markets and fairs, and harangue on horseback, in the most crowded places of public resort,

[1] Notwithstanding, they have still some privileges;—they cannot be compelled to any office civil or military, nor to serve on a jury; they are amerced only according to their temporal estate, nor are they assessed for a robbery committed in the hundred. But these, and other personal exemptions, are countervailed by several disabilities.

See Browne's *Eccles. Law*, Vol. II. p. 253, &c.

[2] *Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 265, note.—The number of clergy in the diocese of Lincoln alone is not less than 1200.

they are vulgarly denominated *Cavalry*
rs."[1]

INENT MEN, AND AUTHORS FOR AND
NST.—On this head, it is less difficult to
w where to begin than where to end; for,
all that I can say, much will remain to be
so many has this United Church produced,
have been "famous in their generation, men
of renown." The Church of England has been styled the *Bulwark of the Reformation*, and that justly; for almost from the days of Wickliff to the present time, she has all along equally supported the Protestant cause, and opposed "all false doctrine, heresy and schism." She has produced a succession of divines, more in number, and greater in point of natural abilities, and professional acquirements, than any other church whatsoever. The sermons of her bishops and clergy will be read and admired, while sound judgment, solid reasoning, and orthodox divinity shall be held in due repute. And, while some of her sons have ably and fully answered every objection that has been made to Christianity, others of them have cleared up and elucidated all its evidences in such a way, as it should seem that no other objections could be made, and that the great Head of the Church were making use of the members of this United Church, as instruments in his hands, for fulfilling his prophecy respecting his

[1] Dr Hales's *Methodism Inspected*, p. 1.

religion, "that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

There is, perhaps, no department in theology, in which her servants have not distinguished themselves; and but few branches of study connected with it, to which some, even of her laity, have not applied, and in which they have not excelled.

Our British divines have not, indeed, excelled so much in systematic divinity, as those of Germany and Holland have done; yet they have not been less eager or successful in their endeavours to establish the truth and illustrate the doctrines of Christianity. And of the members of this Church in particular, it may perhaps be said, that they have discussed the most difficult points of theology, and illustrated particular doctrines with more strength of argument, and perspicuity of language, than are to be met with in the writings of the divines of any other Church or nation. In proof of this, I might mention the works of Pearson—Mede—Barrow—Burnet—Chillingworth—Stillingfleet—Clarke—Tillotson—Taylor—Whitby—Hammond—Sherlock—Secker—Lowth—Jortin—Hurd—Horne, and an hundred others; but the sermons preached at Boyle's Lecture, and collected in three vols. fol., together with the Collection of Tracts against Popery, render every other argument in support of the observation wholly unnecessary.——

"The labours which have disclosed the accomplishment of prophecy, which have vindicated the

truth of miracles, and brought forward the beauty and consistency of revealed doctrines, have inscribed their deductions on monuments that can fall but with the decay of science, and be buried only in the general ruins of literature and knowledge."[z]

Nor have the members of this Church been more eminent for solid learning, than for true piety and sterling virtue, and all those more valuable qualities, with a view to which the Church of Christ was established upon earth, and which only will retain their value in the Church triumphant in heaven. Fervent piety—Christian zeal—active benevolence, and practical virtue, though less dazzling in the eyes of the world, are so much the more valuable than the highest literary attainments, in that they are more durable; for "whether there be knowledge, it shall *vanish away*;" and so much the more profitable, in that, though they cannot boast of the same degree of the honour that cometh from man, they have equally the promise of the happiness that now is, and they lead more directly to that which is to come.

In every age, the different branches of the now United Church, have exhibited such "burning and shining lights," as will be had "in everlasting remembrance;" and many, doubtless, multitudes have for a season rejoiced in the light of others, whose names may have never reached beyond the sphere of their own usefulness, whose

[z] Gray's *Bamp. Lect.* p. 78.

virtues have never been recorded, or whose memories are forgotten. And that in this age, and at the present day, she is less favoured in this respect than at any former period, those only will be disposed to maintain, who, having eyes, will not see, or, having ears, will not hear. For notwithstanding many of her sons and servants may have no great pretensions to piety, and some of them as little to learning, she can yet boast of those in all ranks and orders, from the prelate on the bench to the village curate, who are eminently distinguished for both the one and the other. She may also boast of men, neither ignorant nor unlearned, who labour in her service with ardent zeal—with unwearied diligence—with scrupulous fidelity, and with various success:—of men, in short, who preaching the word, are "instant in season, out of season," and whose zeal is according to knowledge, and *without innovation.*

To the professional labours and consistent conduct of some men of this character, had I not myself been an eye witness for years together, I should scarcely have believed that Christianity, as we find it in Scripture, was so justly reflected in the lives of any of its professors, in these days of lukewarmness and indifference, or that there were any at this time who made so near approaches to what the ministers of the Gospel once were, and what they ought at all times to be.

And yet, "tell it not in Gath," publish it not in the ears of the enemies of the Church, or of

religion, such men, and many such there doubtless are at this day, besides those whom I have the happiness to know, (classed, if not mixed, with others, I admit, of a less honourable and consistent deportment; but I speak not here of men who can be justly charged with heterodoxy, irregularity, or enthusiasm)—even such men are viewed with contempt, and loaded with opprobrious names by many of their brethren and others;—by those in particular, it is presumed, I will not say, who are the least distinguished by their piet and worth, but rather, who have the misfortune to know them the least.'

* It has been remarked, that in every period, from the dawn of the Reformation in the reign of Edward III., as in the ages that preceded that æra, the practical Christian has uniformly been designated by some arbitrary and invidious appellation;—that "in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, this character was denominated a *Wickliffite*, or a *Lollard*,—in the sixteenth, a *Lutheran*, a *Zuinglian*, or a *Huguenot*,—in the seventeenth, he was a *Precisian*, or a *Puritan*,—in the eighteenth, a *Methodist*,—in the nineteenth, a *Calvinist*."—But many of the members of this Church, on whom ignorance or prejudice has freely bestowed this last appellation, do not answer to the name of Calvinist, in any sense; and not a few of those others, who cannot so justly disclaim it, yet reject the most distinguishing point of Calvinism, the doctrine of *Particular Redemption*.

"It was reported and *believed*, that Arminius had kissed the Pope's toe, when he had only seen him in a crowd;—that he had contracted an intimacy with Jesuits, whom he had never heard of;—that he had introduced himself to Bellarmine, whom he had never seen;—and that he had abjured the reformed religion, for which he was prepared to die."—The disciple is not above his master, and "if they have called the master of the house *Beelzebub*, how much more," &c.?——

I have, however, no hesitation in saying, that I know of no set of men in any church, sect, or country, who have themselves made higher attainments in religion,—or, who aim more stedfastly and uniformly to promote the cause of religion in others; and none, of course, who deserve better of their country and of mankind in general. And, however much any may have vainly attempted to obscure the lustre of such characters, I firmly believe, and I believe it on clear Scriptural authority, that not a few of them shall shine hereafter "*as the brightness of the firmament—and as the stars for ever and ever.*"[1]

Among the men who have been eminent in their day and generation, and have from time to time adorned their respective branches of the now United Church, many of whom have been not less distinguised for piety than for learning, may be ranked[2]—Archbishops Cranmer, Usher,* Laud, Wake, Tillotson, Secker, &c.;—Bishops Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, Andrews, Taylor,* Hall, Beveridge, Bedell,* Patrick, Burnet, Bull, Pearson, Stillingfleet, Gastrell, Kenn, Kidder, Walton, Gibson, Wilson, Sherlock, Warburton, Newton, Lowth, Hurd, Horne, &c.;—Deans Prideaux, Stanhope, Sherlock, Tucker, &c.;—Drs Bentley, Barrow, Berriman, Bennet, Cave, Cudworth, Ellis,* Hammond, Heylin, Jackson, Jenkins, Jortin, Kennicott, Lightfoot, Mills, Brett, Pococke, South,

[1] Daniel, 12. v. 3

[2] Those marked thus (*) were of the Church of Ireland.

Stebbing, Trapp, Waterland, Whithy, Paley, &c.;—Messrs Nowel, Hooker, Leslie,* Wheatley, Jones.

And of laymen—Lords Bacon, Littleton, &c.; —the Honourable Robert Boyle, Sir Isaac Newton, Dr Samuel Johnson;—Messrs Addison, Dodwell, Nelson, West, Bryant, &c.

Of these have written in defence of the Church of England against that of Rome—Bishop Jewel, in his *Apology;* Archbishop Usher, in his *Answer to a Jesuit;* Archbishop Laud, *against Fisher;* Bishop Bull, in his *Vindication of the Church of England from the errors of the Church of Rome;* Dr Heylin, in his *Ecclesia Vindicata,* or Church of England Justified; Dr Bennett, in his *Confutation of Popery;* Dr Trapp, in his *Church of England defended against the Calumnies and False Reasonings of the Church of Rome,*[1] &c.

Against the *Dissenters*—Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity;* Dr Nicholls, in his *Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England;* Leslie, in his *Rehearsals,*[2] &c.; Bishop Sherlock, in his *Vindication of the Corporation and Test Act;* Bishop Hall, and Dr Brett, in their *Divine Right of Episcopacy;* Bishop Taylor, in his *Defence of Episcopacy;* Archbishop King, in his *Inventions of Men in the Worship of God,* &c.

[1] See also, among various other works on the subject, several Tracts against Popery, by Archbishop Wake.

See also above, p. 37, Note.

[2] In 6 vols. 12mo. Or, see his works in 2 vols. folio.

On the other side, the Church of England has been attacked by several Papists, particularly by the Jesuits, Harding, in his *Controversy* with Bishop Jewel; Fisher, in his *Conference* with Archbishop Laud; and Malone, in *The Jesuits Challenge*, which was answered by Archbishop Usher.

And by the *Dissenters*, directly or indirectly, in Neal's *History of the Puritans*; Towgood's *Letter to White*; Dr Gill's *Dissenters' Reasons for separating from the Church of England*; and, I may add, in *The Protestant Dissenter's Catechism*, a work which, I humbly think, reflects no credit on the author, whoever he was, or on those whose principles it is meant to support.[1]

[1] Should any think it necessary to ask, why the author has given less attention to the subject of this article, than to that of several others in his work; or, in other words, why he has not taken more pains to illustrate the doctrine, worship, constitution, &c. of the church from which he himself received his orders, and in whose service he spent the first years of his ministry? He answers, That when writing on this subject, (but *then only*) he wishes to consider himself, with our great poet, the author of *Paradise Lost*, as of no church or sect whatsoever.—Besides, "A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid;" and had not most other denominations stood much more in need of illustration than the *United Church of England and Ireland* did, he should never have taken the trouble of writing, or given the public the trouble of reading, a work of this nature.

THE

EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN

SCOTLAND.

HISTORY.—The society of Christians which forms the subject of this article, is not one of those novel sects whose first appearance and distinguishing tenets are only of yesterday, but the venerable remains of what was formerly the Established Church of this country. It holds spiritual communion with the more flourishing and distinguished branch of the Catholic Church just considered, and also with the Episcopal Church in America; but disclaiming all foreign jurisdiction, its members are united, in all matters of ecclesiastical concern, under the regular successors of those Scottish bishops, who, in consequence of the Revolution, in 1688, were deprived of their temporal honours and privileges, but still continued to exercise their spiritual powers, for the benefit of that part of the Church of Christ which had been committed to their charge.

The title of *Nonjurors*, by which they were chiefly known for about a century from the above æra, and which was imposed on all those, both in Britain and Ireland, who refused to swear allegiance to King William and Queen Mary, and their successors, is now very justly dropt, the occasion of it having ceased, at least as far as this church is concerned. For, on the death of the last person who maintained his claim to the crown of Britain, in opposition to the reigning family and existing government, its members made offer of their dutiful allegiance to our present beloved and most gracious sovereign; and no sooner could they have done it, without a dereliction of their principles.

This religious society has subsisted in various circumstances of prosperity and adversity; it has been blessed with good fortune, and fostered by the hand of earthly power; and, through the instability of human authority and grandeur, it has likewise been plunged into the very depth of adversity, there to learn the lesson of patient endurance for conscience sake, and to give glory to God, by humbly acquiescing in the justice and righteousness of his judgments. Almost ever since the Reformation, and particularly for about a century from the æra of the Revolution, its history, like the mystic scroll of the prophet, is inscribed, within and without, "with lamentation, and mourning, and woe." No portion, indeed, of the Catholic Church of Christ, has undergone a greater variety of fortune; nor, perhaps, is there

at this day, any religious society that has been more conformed to primitive Christianity, either in its external or internal condition.

It is well known to those who are acquainted with the history of the church in this country, that the Reformation, which began to dawn here in 1527, but received not a legal establishment till 1560,[1] was carried on with much tumult and confusion; and that for many years, various forms of ecclesiastical polity were adopted, one after another, and under as many different denominations. The *Lords*, or leaders, of the *Congregation*, which was the name assumed by the first reformers, disliking the name much more than the reality of Episcopacy, at first set up a shadow of it, projected by the celebrated John Knox, or copied from the Lutherans in Germany, under the name of a *Superintendency*. This was a new and anomalous form of church polity; for, though the superintendents held their office for life, and their power was Episcopal, yet some of them had not even the form of an ordination, and none of them were possessed of any higher commission than those over whom they presided.

No wonder then that this strange device was of short continuance; it was found to fail in answering the purposes of church government, and was soon very generally disapproved, so that a new form was proposed and adopted in 1572,

[1] Or, according to others, not till 1567.

when the name of Episcopacy was resumed, together with almost every thing that was necessary to constitute its essence and reality, except the consecration of bishops, which was strangely overlooked. Nor did this improved, but still defective, constitution of the Church long continue; for the reforming party, ever ready to pull down with one hand what they had just raised with the other, began to call Episcopacy in question in 1575, and in 1580 they condemned it as unlawful and unscriptural, and soon departed much farther from it than before. Not stopping at a superintendency, they made nearer approaches to Presbyterianism; and, through the influence of Mr Andrew Melvil, who, admiring that novel form of church government as lately set up at Geneva, was a great promoter, if not the first parent, of Presbyterian parity here, it was at last adopted, and became the establishment in 1592.

In this state, and under this form of government, the church continued till the accession of King James to the crown of England. That monarch, whose wisdom and measures of policy have been extravagantly praised by some, and undeservedly blamed by others, had long been endeavouring, by a prudent and peaceable mixture of advice and authority, to put ecclesiastical affairs in his ancient hereditary kingdom of Scotland, on a more regular and permanent foundation. And, by his accession to the English

throne, becoming better acquainted with the doctrine and worship of the Church of England, he appears to have been thoroughly convinced, not only of the authority of Episcopacy, as a divinely instituted form of church government, but also of its superior advantages for promoting Christian piety, and producing due subordination, peace, and harmony, among Christian people. Under the influence of this conviction, and having taken such measures of prudence and precaution as were necessary to ensure the peaceable and cordial adoption of his plan, he called up to London three of those distinguished preachers, who had been nominated to bishoprics,[1] that they might have regular consecration from the hands of the English bishops, and so constitute a regular Episcopal Church, and be qualified to keep up the Episcopal succession in Scotland.

The consecration was accordingly performed, on the 21st October, 1610, in the chapel of London-House, by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath. And the three newly-ordained prelates, on their return to Scotland, conveyed the same Episcopal powers and authority, with which they themselves had been duly and canonically invested, to their former titular brethren who had been duly nominated to that office and dignity; by which means, a true and regular Episcopacy was

[1] Mr John Spotswood, titular Archbishop of Glasgow; Mr Andrew Lamb, titular Bishop of Brechin; and Mr Gavin Hamilton, titular Bishop of Galloway.

when the name of Episcopacy was resumed, together with almost every thing that was necessary to constitute its essence and reality, except the consecration of bishops, which was strangely overlooked. Nor did this improved, but still defective, constitution of the Church long continue; for the reforming party, ever ready to pull down with [illegible] they had just raised with the [illegible]er, [illegible]n to c[illegible]iscopacy in question in [illegible] condemned it as unlawful a[illegible] soon departed much farther [illegible] Not stopping at a su[illegible]e nearer approaches [illegible]Pre[illegible]hrough the influence of Mr [illegible]), admiring that novel [illegible]n [illegible]nent as lately set up at Gene[illegible], a great promoter, if not the first parent, of Presbyterian parity here, it was at last adopted, and became the establishment in 1592.

In this state, and under this form of government, the church continued till the accession of King James to the crown of England. That monarch, whose wisdom and measures of policy have been extravagantly praised by some, and undeservedly blamed by others, had long been endeavouring, by a prudent and peaceable mixture of advice and authority, to put ecclesiastical affairs in his ancient hereditary kingdom of Scotland, on a more regular and permanent foundation. And, by his accession to the English

throne, becoming better acquainted with the doctrine and worship of the Church of England, he appears to have been thoroughly convinced, not only of the authority of Episcopacy, as a divinely instituted form of church government, but also of its superior advantages for promoting Christian piety, and producing due subordination, peace, and harmony, among Christian people. Under the influence of this conviction, and having taken such measures of prudence and precaution as were necessary to ensure the peaceable and cordial adoption of his plan, he called up to London three of those distinguished preachers, who had been nominated to bishoprics,[1] that they might have regular consecration from the hands of the English bishops, and so constitute a regular Episcopal Church, and be qualified to keep up the Episcopal succession in Scotland.

The consecration was accordingly performed, on the 21st October, 1610, in the chapel of London-House, by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath. And the three newly-ordained prelates, on their return to Scotland, conveyed the same Episcopal powers and authority, with which they themselves had been duly and canonically invested, to their former titular brethren who had been duly nominated to that office and dignity; by which means, a true and regular Episcopacy was

[1] Mr John Spotswood, titular Archbishop of Glasgow; Mr Andrew Lamb, titular Bishop of Brechin; and Mr Gavin Hamilton, titular Bishop of Galloway.

at length introduced into the Reformed Church of Scotland; "and that," says Bishop Guthry, "not without the consent and furtherance of many of the wisest among the ministry."[1]

Instead of the mere shadow of Episcopacy which had formerly been set up, we now see an Episcopal Church settled on the solid foundation of a regular apostolic succession, derived from the Church of England, which has been justly styled, even by foreigners, "*the glory of the Reformation.*" This change was chiefly brought about by the pious and prudent policy of the sovereign himself, who had the happiness to find it generally approved by a great majority of his subjects, and to see the good effects of it, by the return of peace and harmony among all ranks of people. Nor was it in the power of those fanatical levellers, who had long kept both church and state in a continual ferment, to create any very serious disturbance, for some time, under this more regular form of church polity. At length, however, they prevailed, and fully accomplished their object; for this calm was changed into a storm, and this sunshine into "darkness visible;" and the Episcopal Church, it seems, after the pattern of her Lord and Master, was destined to be tried in the furnace of adversity, and disciplined in the school of affliction. The spirit of faction and rebellion which had begun to ferment during the life of James, broke out into open rupture in the reign

[1] *Memoirs*, p. 7.

of his son Charles, and at last terminated in the total overthrow of the constitution, both civil and ecclesiastical. The Church was again thrown into the utmost confusion. A parity of ministers was adopted in 1638, and a "*Solemn League and Covenant*" was entered into for effecting the entire extirpation "of prelacy, or the government of the Church by archbishops and bishops, and all the ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy." Monarchy and Episcopacy shared the same fate; their rights were trampled upon, and their honour laid in the dust. The long night of tyranny and persecution that followed, brought the Episcopal succession in Scotland to almost total extinction; for the bishops, who had been driven into exile by the violence of the times, had all died, except one, without being able to provide for it.

When, therefore, the restoration of Episcopacy was determined upon, in consequence of the restoration of monarchy in the person of Charles II., before that measure could be carried into effect, the necessity of the case required, that application should again be made to the Church of England for assistance. Nine of the English bishops had survived the usurpation of Cromwell, having, no doubt, been providentially preserved to re-establish their own church, and to lay again the foundation of the ecclesiastical edifice in Scotland. With this view, and to make the necessary provision for the full restoration of Episcopacy, recourse was had to the same expedient which had

been adopted about fifty years before; and accordingly, four[1] of those persons who had been selected by his majesty for the Scottish Episcopate, being convinced of the invalidity of their former ordination, were first ordained deacons and priests, and then were consecrated in St Peter's Church, Westminster, on the 15th of December, 1661, by four of the English bishops.[2]

The four newly consecrated prelates, on their return to Scotland, took possession of the several sees to which they had been appointed; the other ten sees were soon canonically filled by men duly invested with the Episcopal character; and this restoration of Episcopacy, after suffering

[1] Dr Sharp, Mr Andrew Fairfowl, Mr Robert Leighton, and Mr James Hamilton.

[2] The Scottish preachers who were called to London in 1610, were not raised to the Episcopate in the same regular way, notwithstanding Dr Andrews, bishop of Ely, suggested the propriety of their being previously ordained deacons and priests, as was done in this instance.—The validity of Presbyterian ordination has been sometimes contended for in cases of necessity; and irregular ministers were frequently allowed to officiate, in the scarcity of pastors in Queen Elizabeth's reign. Such ordination has, however, been justly condemned in all cases not unavoidable, as an unauthorised deviation from the universal practice of the church for fifteen centuries. And Archbishop Bancroft's insisting that those Scottish preachers, who had not received Episcopal ordination, might be consecrated in the reign of James VI., is no doubt considered, by many sound churchmen, as bespeaking an unnecessary degree of delicacy towards the Reformed Churches abroad; and was chiefly, if not solely justifiable, upon the idea that the whole Episcopal character might be conveyed at one ordination.

an eclipse, and tumultuous interruption of 24 years, was confirmed in the next session of the Scottish parliament, which met in May 1662.

Thus was Episcopacy once more restored in Scotland, and it continued to be the established form of church government till the Revolution in 1688; during which time, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, it was professed with much cordiality by a great majority of the inhabitants of this kingdom. But the unhappy political measures of James the VII., fatally encouraged by some of his faithless and treacherous courtiers, having raised a powerful combination against him, which eventually dethroned him, and drove him into exile; the Church of Scotland was destined to partake of his adverse fortune, without having ever conferred its approbation on the objectionable parts of his public conduct. Her bishops and clergy, taking the apostolical precept of submission to the supreme power in the most literal sense, and reasoning upon the principles of the constitution as then generally understood, conceived their allegiance as due to that monarch, and that it could never be dissolved but by his death, and therefore refused the oaths of allegiance and assurance to King William, and afterwards the oath of abjuration; from which circumstance, as already observed, they obtained the name of *Nonjurors*. This refusal they made at the hazard of all their worldly dignities and emoluments; and however imprudent their con-

duct may appear in a worldly view, it is evident, from the sacrifices which they made, that they acted with integrity, and from the most disinterested and conscientious motives.

"But, whether it was owing to the offensive principles maintained by the bishops, and their followers, or rather to that article in the *Claim of Right* set up by the *Convention* of the estates of Scotland, which declared '*prelacy*, or any sort of Episcopal *superiority*, to be a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation:—whichever of these causes operated most powerfully in producing the designed effect, so it was, that the same convention, having been turned into a parliament, passed an act on the 22d July, 1689, for 'abolishing prelacy, and all superiority of any office in the Church of this kingdom above Presbyters.'

"In consequence of this abolition, which was followed, the year after, by the establishment of the Presbyterian form of church government, the bishops were deprived of every thing connected with their office which the civil power could take from them. They lost their revenues, and temporal jurisdiction, but their spiritual authority still remained; and that "gift of God," which they had received by the imposition of Episcopal hands, they considered themselves bound to exercise for promoting that Episcopal 'work in the Church of God which had been committed to them.' By virtue of this commission, they continued, in a quiet and peaceable manner, to dis-

charge the duties of their spiritual function. They ordained ministers for such vacant congregations as adhered to their communion; and when they saw it necessary to attend to the preservation of their own order, they proceeded to the consecration of such persons as were thought most proper for being invested with that sacred and important trust,"[1] without asking permission from the exiled, or from the reigning prince.[2]

At this memorable æra, Episcopacy was voted a grievance to the nation, though three fourths even of the common people, and a much greater proportion of the higher ranks, were then Episcopalians; and the clergy were deprived of the profits of their benefices, from the very time that they were turned out of their livings by the rabble.

Such being the conduct and consequent circumstances of the governors and clergy of the Scottish Church, they have, on this occasion, exhibited an instance of disinterestedness, of generous attachment to fallen majesty, and of conscientious adherence to principle, than which, the history of the world does not furnish one more illustrious. Whether they acted rightly or not, is a question that, from the opposite views and discordant principles and passions of mankind, we can scarcely suppose will ever be determined to the satisfaction of all parties. This much, however, is certain, that had those venerable fa-

[1] Bishop Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order*, pp. 352-3.
[2] See above, p. 377.

thers possessed the more pliant principles of many distinguished characters of that turbulent period, they might have remained in the peaceable possession of their dignities and worldly preferments; for it is well known, that the Prince of Orange, afterwards King William the III., offered to protect them, and preserve their establishment inviolate, provided they would have come over to his interest, and supported his pretensions to the throne.

But this, from a principle of conscience, they *unanimously* declined to do, and the consequences were, in addition to what we have already seen, that they and their clergy were given up a prey to their enemies, and were exposed to such hardships and indignities, as one cannot read of without emotion, or think of without pain. Some relaxation of the severities with which they were treated under King William, was, however, granted them by Queen Anne; and an act of parliament was passed in 1712, "to prevent the disturbing of those of the Episcopal communion in Scotland, in the exercise of their religious worship, and in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England." In consequence of this indulgence, that Liturgy, which the ablest of them had long professed to admire, was universally adopted by them; and public chapels, which had till then been prohibited, were every where built, and well frequented.

The same principles which had influenced them to withhold their allegiance from King William and

Queen Anne, would not allow them, as a body, to transfer it to a new family, clogged as it was by so many oaths, especially by that of abjuration. Yet many individuals complied with the government, and gave every test of allegiance which was required of them; but, as if the insurgents of 1715 had been wholly of their communion, new restraints were then laid upon their public worship, and upon theirs only, which no doubt revived in some degree their original prepossessions. These restraints, however, were neither very severe, nor of long continuance; for, by the year 1720, their congregations were as numerous as formerly, consisting, especially in the north, of men of all ranks, even such as held offices of trust under the established government.

Though the public devotions of their Church did not exhibit that mark of attachment to the reigning prince, which is now become an indispensible criterion of loyalty, they never restricted the meaning of her members to the particular person, whom they themselves favoured; nor did they ever reject from her communion those who had given every other testimony of their loyalty which the law required. On the contrary, till the prohibitory acts passed in 1746 and 1748, in consequence of another attempt to reinstate the family of Stuart on the throne of their ancestors, which affected her laity as well as clergy, officers of the army and revenue, judges in the King's courts, justices of the peace, and freeholders, qualified according to law, were admitted and acknow-

ledged as members of their Church, and joined in her worship in the most public manner.' So that however warmly attached her members, and in particular her bishops and clergy, at any time were to the House of Stuart, it is not fair to impute to them jacobitism, or any mere political principle, as their distinguishing tenet. However zealous many of her communion were, in those hostile attempts that were made to reinstate the ancient royal family on the throne of their ancestors, and however sincerely her bishops and clergy may have wished to see that object effected; yet, it cannot be justly alleged, that her members came forward, as a body, in opposition to the existing government, nor that her clergy made political opinions terms of their communion, or fanned the flame of rebellion; nothing being more contrary to their principles than the fashionable doctrine of resistance, which they conceive to be contrary to scripture, as well as to be the source of that anarchical tyranny, which has

[a] Whatever might have been the hardships to which the clergy of this church were exposed, they did not extend to the laity of her communion, who had taken the oaths to government, till 1748, but then no one could vote for a representative in Parliament, who had been twice present at her worship, within the space of a year preceding the day of election. And if, besides the officiating clergyman and his family, the number of worshippers at any time exceeded *four*, they were all liable to be imprisoned for six months, although they should have given the test of their civil allegiance, prescribed by the law.

now been deluging Europe for nearly twenty years.

Notwithstanding, their disaffection being manifest, and, indeed, what they never wished to disavow or conceal, they were involved, both clergy and laity, in the direful consequences of those unsuccessful attempts; and Episcopacy had unquestionably been extinguished in Scotland, but for the protecting providence of the invisible Head of the Church. Nothing less than the extinction of it seems to have been the aim of those, whose enmity proposed, and whose influence procured to be enacted, those penal statutes of 1746 and 1748, which were less calculated to eradicate the attachment of this society to the house of Stuart, than to produce disaffection to the existing government, where it did not previously exist. They had also an unhappy effect on the religion of the country; for, by driving out of the Episcopal Church many persons of distinction, whose principles, or prejudices, would not allow them to communicate with any other society of Christians around them; the consequence was, that neglect of religion, and of the duties of public worship, which has long furnished matter of serious regret, and which is still too visible, even at the present day.

Upon the clergy, however, those rigorous laws were not long rigorously executed. After a few years, the burning of chapels, and the imprisoning of ministers, were occurrences that seldom happened; but in as far as those laws affected the political privileges of those laymen who fre-

quented their chapels, in that part of their operation, they were in no degree relaxed till 1792, when they were wholly repealed, and the Scotch Episcopalians tolerated, like other well-affected dissenters from the national establishment.

On the death of the late Prince Charles Edward, in 1788, the situation which his brother, the Cardinal York, still held in the Church of Rome, precluding him from sitting on the throne of his ancestors, even had he asserted his right to that honour, and there being then no other claimant, and indeed no other person whose claim was preferable to that of the reigning family, and who had not already acknowledged the existing government, the bishops and clergy of this church thought themselves at full liberty to offer their dutiful allegiance to the Sovereign now upon the throne. Their tender of loyalty was very graciously received; and, on application to parliament, those penal laws that had been enacted against them, were repealed, on certain terms, in 1792, whereby the doors of the Episcopal chapels were opened to all ranks of the laity, who were disposed to enter in; and many of the most distinguished in the kingdom have availed themselves of the privilege.

Since that period, the Episcopal Church has likewise procured a great accession in numbers, and respectability, from several congregations under the pastoral care of English ordained clergymen, having united in religious communion with her bishops and clergy.

To many readers, it may seem a circumstance somewhat strange, and not easily to be accounted for, that there should be in this country two branches of what is called the Episcopal persuasion, standing aloof from each other, and still continuing in a state of separation. It may, therefore, be necessary to observe, that during the long night of trial, to which this depressed, but pure part of Christ's Church has been subjected, the legal restraints, and civil disqualifications to which its members were exposed, induced many of them to forsake its communion, especially those who, by holding appointments under government, could not, as they thought, either consistently, or safely, attend the sacred ministrations of *nonjuring* clergymen; and, that this circumstance gave rise to the political expedient of introducing into Scotland, Episcopal clergymen, ordained by English or Irish bishops, and thereby legally qualified to officiate in chapels licensed for that purpose.

Thus, to add to the sufferings of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, another schism broke out in her very bosom; she was again doomed to behold many of her children forsake her, and once more to hear some of her members say, "we have no need of thee." But human policy is seldom a sure guide in matters of religion; and though such clergymen called themselves Episcopal, they were deficient in the most essential article that could entitle them to such an appellation, by exercising their ministry, not only with-

out the authority of any bishop, but in a state of separation from the only bishops who could give them such spiritual authority.

Equally groundless was their pretence of connection with the Church of England; for it is well known, that the bishops who ordained them, whether of England or of Ireland, never pretended to any sort of Episcopal authority in Scotland.—"The jurisdiction of the Church of England does not extend to them, *that* of the Episcopal Church of Scotland they reject; so that their condition is *unique* in its kind, and unprecedented in the history of the Christian Church:—the congregations in which they officiate, being (if it may be so said), dependent and independent at the same time; *i. e. nominally* dependent on a church, with which they have no ecclesiastical connection, and *really* independent on a church, with which, from local situation, they are bound by the principle of ecclesiastical obedience, to unite."[1]

[1] Mr, now Archdeacon, Daubeny's, *Letter to a Scotch Nobleman, on the subject of Ecclesiastical Unity*, subjoined to a *Layman's Account of his Faith and Practice, as a Member of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, 12mo. p. 177.

According to Bishop Burnet, so exact an observer of ecclesiastical rules was Bishop Bedell, "that he would perform no part of his function out of his own diocese, without obtaining the Ordinary's leave for it; so that being in Dublin, when his wife's daughter was to be married to Mr Clogy, and they both desired to be blessed by him, he would not do it, till he first took out a licence for it in the Archbishop of Dublin's Consistory."

Life of Bishop Bedell, Edit. 1736, p. 136.

Their affectionate mother, beholding these her prodigal sons, thus circumstanced, has long been inviting them to return, and nothing has been wanting, on her part, to facilitate their return to their duty. With this view she removed those political obstacles, which first occasioned their departure from her, as soon as she could do it, consistently with her principles; and, to pave the way for the adoption of their pastors, into her household of faith, she has more lately accepted, as her public confessional, those very articles of religion, which they had already acknowledged and subscribed; and they are assured, from undoubted authority, that their becoming her adopted sons, and servants, will not in the least affect their interest or promotion, in that church, from which they came out. If any thing more than this is wanting, to effect this desirable object, the healing of this needless schism, it can be only, an equal desire on their part to accept the invitation given them. *Private* reasons they may possibly have for not accepting it; and of the force of these, till they are publicly known, the public are incompetent to judge; but on the ground of politics or religion, it is plain that they can now have none. They must be aware, that by accepting it, all the advantages will be on their own side; they will themselves thereby become regular clergymen of a regular church, and their hearers will be entitled to the benefit of Confirmation, and to every other Christian privilege, that can result from

their connection with a pure and rightly constituted church.

It may, therefore, be hoped, that the laudable example that has been shewn them, by some of the most distinguished pastors and congregations of the separation, will soon be universally followed:—that the time is not now far distant, when all who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, will be united, as formerly, in that one body, of which their predecessors were members, and thus be happily disposed, with one mind, and one mouth, to glorify the God of their salvation.

Such an union appears to be a measure extremely desirable, and well calculated to promote the interests of true religion; and it is thus only that they can act consistently with their professions and prayers, and avoid the imputation of setting up altar against altar, a thing severely censured by the primitive church, and no less disapproved by the United Church of England and Ireland.—"It is evident, however, that such an union can then only answer the intended purpose, and serve to make this body both regular and respectable, when it is formed on right motives, and from a due regard to those sacred principles which are founded in the knowledge, and necessarily interwoven with our belief of the true nature and constitution of the Christian Church."[1]

[1] Bishop Skinner's *Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland.* See his *Primitive Truth and Order*, p. 494.

See Archbishop Spotswood's *History of the Church of Scotland*, folio; *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, by Bishop Sage; and Mr Skinner's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, in 2 vols. 8vo.

This last work is recommended by the late venerable and Rev. W. Jones, of Nayland, in his *Life of Bishop Horne*, as proper to be read by all those who wish to become acquainted with the history and fortunes of this church.

DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINES.—The Church of Scotland had no regular Confession of Faith, nor any articles of religion in the beginning of her Reformation; but, in 1561, John Knox, assisted by some other divines, drew up a Confession of Faith, which was adopted, and afterwards ratified in 1567; and it continued to be the uniform standard of her doctrine, under all her forms, for upwards of 80 years.

This system, comprised in twenty-five articles, and which may be seen in the *History of the Reformation* attributed to John Knox,[1] differs little in essentials from the articles of most other reformed Churches;—in every thing unconnected with Popery, is moderate, if not unexceptionable; and in those points that are disputed among Pro-

[1] It is entitled, *The Confession of the Faith and Doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland*, &c. and may also be seen in the *Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of Church Government, Discipline*, &c. *of Public Authority in the Church of Scotland*, &c. 8vo. Glasgow, 1785.

testants, is certainly less dogmatical than that of the Westminster Assembly which succeeded it, and which is now the legal standard in Scotland.

It was indeed so well received by all parties, that it was constantly subscribed both by Episcopalians and Presbyterians, till 1645, when some of the Scotch members of the Westminster Assembly, who were violent in their tempers, and high in their notions, objected to it as favouring the Arminian scheme, but certainly without reason. The *Westminster Confession* was in consequence adopted, and was ratified by the parliament of Scotland in 1649, but was rejected at the Restoration; though, when Episcopacy was re-established in 1662, it is somewhat remarkable, that nothing was said concerning a system of articles, and yet this neglect was never called in question till 1682, when the *Test Act* was proposed and carried through parliament by the influence of the Duke of York. It was then proposed in council, that a system of faith should be fixed on, to ascertain the religion *by law* established; and, after much debate, that of 1561, which was all along acknowledged by the Episcopalians, though not formally adopted and subscribed, was made choice of, and continued to be the public formulary till the Revolution.

From that period, which forms a memorable æra in the history of this Church, no subscription was required from her clergy to any regular system of Christian principles, for upwards of a century. They were only required, at their or-

dinations, solemnly to profess their belief of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, and to declare their persuasion that those books contain every thing necessary to salvation, through faith in Christ. And the 10th canon of this Church, which is still in force, enjoins, "That every bishop shall be careful to recommend to his clergy, and to such also as may be candidates for holy orders, to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and of the fathers of the apostolical, and two next succeeding ages, and to take all proper opportunities, in their sermons and otherwise, to instruct their people in the truly Catholic principles of that pure and primitive church." This practice continued till 1792, when the act of parliament, which was passed in their favour, required them to subscribe the 39 articles of the Church of England; in dutiful compliance with which, as well as to exhibit a public testimony of their faith, and of their agreement in doctrine with the United Church of England and Ireland, they unanimously and heartily subscribed them in a general convocation, called for that purpose, and holden at Lawrencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the 24th October, 1804.

No one, therefore, who is acquainted with the 39 articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, can be any longer a stranger to the avowed principles of this Church. Or, if any thing further may be added on that subject, it is, that her clergy subscribed them, I believe, *to a*

man, in the *Anti-Calvinistic* sense; so that, whatever weight their opinion may be allowed to have in the scale, it is added to that of the *Anti-Calvinists* in England:[1]—And likewise, that those of them who use the *Scotch Communion Office* in administering the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, subscribed them consistently with their belief of the "*Commemorative Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist*," as some of the ablest divines of the Church of England have done, and as not thinking any expressions in them, with regard to the Lord's Supper, in the least inimical to their practice at the altar, in the use of that office.

Of the congregations under the pastoral care of English ordained clergymen, that have already united with this their mother church, two of the most numerous, and most respectable in the metropolis, with their pastors, have been confessedly

[1] With regard to the eminent reformer, whose system and writings have been the occasion of a most unhappy division in the Church, and whose name is thus inscribed on the standards of his foes, as well as of his followers; there has ever been one party, from his day to the present, who have said that he was a good man, and another, who have as warmly insisted that he deceived the people. And those who wish to know whether, or how far the church, now under consideration, takes the same side in this warm dispute with the first Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, will, no doubt, receive some satisfaction from comparing Bishop Skinner's Sermon before the *Convocation at Lawrencekirk*, in 1804, and its Appendix, with Archbishop Spotswood's Sermon before the *General Assembly at Perth* in 1618. See Bishop Lyndesay's *True Narration* of the Proceedings in that Assembly, 4to. 1621.

induced to form that union, in consequence of the proceedings at Lawrencekirk. And, indeed, as the want of a public and acknowledged formula of their faith has been, since 1792, the only remaining plausible objection to the cordial union in the same church of all the Episcopalians in Scotland, that obstacle being at length happily removed, I cannot help again expressing the wishes of every friend to Episcopacy and good order, that the laudable example thus shewn them, may soon be followed by all others, both pastors and people, of the same description.

Some of the bishops and clergy of this Church are disposed to favour the peculiar doctrines of Mr Hutchinson;[1] but the distinguishing tenets of their society may be said to be the apostolical institution of Episcopacy, and the independency of the church upon the state, in the exercise of those powers which are purely spiritual.

With regard to the origin and the rights of civil government, I am not aware that the Episcopalians in Scotland are unanimous in their opinions, such unanimity having never been required of them as a term of communion; nor have they ever had much inducement to turn their attention to politics. It may, however, be observed, that an attachment to kingly power has always been a characteristic of the members of their society who prefer a limited and hereditary mo-

[1] See the article *Hutchinsonianism* and *Hutchinsonians*, in the last vol. of this work.

narchy, like that of Britain, and maintain that the only source of power is God, and not the people; of course, they are no friends to the fashionable doctrine of resistance. And, however warmly attached they may formerly have been to the family of Stuart, there is now sufficient reason to believe, that his majesty has no better subjects, or more attached to his person, family, and government, on principles of permanent loyalty, than the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. So that all those who know any thing of their principles and practice, will give full credit to the venerable *Primus*, when, in his defence of this Church, he observes, that, "to the king, as our rightful sovereign, and to his royal family, as pledges of a happy succession to his crown and dignity, we feel ourselves attached by all the ties of conscience, as well as gratitude; and have therefore uniformly promoted, to the utmost of our power, those salutary measures of government, which have, from time to time, been adopted, for preserving the internal peace of the kingdom, as well as its security from every hostile invasion."[1]

Were it necessary to add any thing further on the subject of the religious and political sentiments of the members of this Church, it might be sufficient to remark, that they hold the works of the judicious Hooker—of Bishop Taylor—of

[1] *Primitive Truth and Order*, p. 425.

Mr Charles Leslie—of Bishop Horne—of Mr William Jones—and of the learned author of the *Guide to the Church*, in high estimation.

See a small work entitled, *A Layman's Account of his Faith and Practice as a Member of the Episcopal Church in Scotland; published with the approbation of the Bishops of that Church.*

Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies.—It cannot be supposed, that, in the infant state of the Reformed Church of Scotland, her form of worship could be regular; and yet we find, that the first reformers made use of a Book of Common Prayer so early as 1557, which is generally thought to have been the Liturgy of the Church of England. Though John Knox objected to some parts of that book, he was not so unfriendly either to liturgical worship, or to a due subordination of ministers, as his successor, Andrew Melvil; for there is a form of prayer which was for some time in use, that is generally understood to have been composed by him, and is still known by the name of *John Knox's Liturgy*. It was approved by John Calvin, and first printed in English in 1561, though not generally adopted till 1564, and it continued in use only till 1580. But, notwithstanding this acknowledged form, it would appear, that the ministers were not restricted, on ordinary occasions, to the use of it, and that public worship was performed, during that period, sometimes in one form, sometimes in ano-

ther, and that confusion in the state occasioned confusion in the church.[1]

Episcopacy was first called in question in 1575, (the same year in which Melvil returned from Geneva,) and when Presbyterianism began to prevail in 1580, the leaders of that party, although bigotted and grossly ignorant, yet had the good sense to point out an uniform practice of religious worship. Their form of worship was plain and simple, and differed in some measure, but in few material points, from the former; and both the Presbyterians and Episcopalians complied with it, without making any objections till towards the latter end of the reign of King Charles I.; by which time Melvil's abhorrence to every appearance of liturgical worship had been so widely extended, and become so deeply rooted in the minds of the people, that an attempt in 1637 to introduce into this Church a book of Common Prayer, copied with some alterations from that of England, produced the "*Solemn League and Covenant*," which involved in one common ruin that unfortunate prince, and the constitution both of church and state.

From 1645, till the restoration in 1662, the

[1] See above, p. 299. Note (2.)

The prescribed forms were chiefly to be adopted by those ministers who had not received much education, which was the case with many just after the Reformation, who had newly become converts from Popery; and it is probable, that they were always used by those persons who were called *Readers*. But the generality of ministers appear to have used great latitude, sometimes, indeed, rather offensively, in their public prayers.

Westminster Directory was adopted, but by no means strictly adhered to, in various instances, as in that of praying for the civil government; for, though it enjoins that duty, no such prayers were put up during that long night of innovation and confusion.

When Episcopacy was restored, together with the monarchy, it was not thought advisable to renew the attempt to introduce a public Liturgy; and except at ordinations, when the English forms were used, as far as local circumstances would admit, no regular form of prayer was in general use while Episcopacy continued to be the established church.

"Many, indeed, of the Episcopal clergy, compiled forms to be used by themselves in their particular congregations, with some petitions and collects taken out of the English book; and all of them uniformly concluded their prayers with the Lord's Prayer, and their singing with the Doxology, both which the zealots of the other side decried as superstitious and formal. The two sacraments were administered by both mostly in the same manner, without kneeling at the one, or signing with the sign of the cross in the other; only in baptism the Episcopal clergy required the Apostle's Creed, and the Presbyterians, in general, the Westminster Confession; and some of the more rigid of them, the Solemn League and Covenant, to be the model of the child's religious education."[1]

[1] Mr Skinner's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, Vol. II. pp. 467-8.

In this state the form of worship continued till 1712, when, as already observed, the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England was adopted. This Liturgy, then introduced, has ever since been uniformly used, not only in the morning and evening services, but also in all other occasional offices, with as little variation as the difference of circumstances will admit, excepting in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. In that service the *Scotch Communion Office* has been generally adopted in their congregations, not only because it is Scotch, and was authorized by king Charles I., but chiefly because it is more conformable to the most ancient Liturgies of the primitive church than the English; was approved of in its model by the first reformers, and many learned and eminent divines since, of the Church of England; and, because it is more agreeable to the sentiments, which they have been taught to entertain, respecting the nature and design of that divine institution, and which are well known to have prevailed in the first and best ages of the Christian church.

This office is not only agreeable to that authorized by King Charles I., which made part of the only reformed Liturgy that ever had the sanction of a legal establishment in Scotland, but is likewise formed on the model of the office in the first Liturgy of Edward VI., which was composed by the learned and venerable fathers of the English Reformation. As it now stands with some variations from both these, with respect to arrangement and order, it retains the *Invocation*

of the Holy Spirit, and the *Oblation* of the sacramental elements; parts of this solemn service formerly considered of such importance, that they are to be found in every Orthodox Church from the days of our Saviour till the Reformation. And it views the Holy Eucharist not in the same light with the Church of Rome, as being a proper propitiating sacrifice, in which the body and blood of Christ, in truth, reality, and substance, are offered up, but with the first Christians, who considered it to be a *commemorative* sacrifice and *typical representation*, by way of memorial of the grand sacrifice that had been offered up on the cross by Jesus Christ. "An idea which perfectly secures the possessors of it from the gross corruption of the Church of Rome; because the *commemoration* of a fact, cannot be the *fact itself*; the representation cannot be the thing designed to be represented; the sign cannot be the reality which it is meant to signify. Such is the idea," says the present learned Archdeacon of Sarum, "which our church entertains upon this subject. She considers the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a feast upon a sacrifice; to constitute it such, that which is feasted upon, must have been first made a sacrifice, by having been offered up by a priest. Such," adds he, "is the idea which the Scotch Episcopal Church has upon this sacred subject; which, by forming her communion service upon the model of that set forth for the use of the Church of England in the reign of Edward VI., still keeps closer to the original pattern of the primitive church, in the celebration of this

service, than the Church of England now does."[1] In commemoration of the blood and water which flowed from our Saviour's side when pierced with the spear, every branch of the Christian church, the Armenians excepted,[2] administered the sacrament of the blood of Christ in a mixed cup of wine and water, till the Reformation, when Luther first departed from this primitive practice, and was followed by the reformers at Geneva.[3] The mixture is accordingly practised in this church, though not enjoined in her Communion Office.

Upon the whole, this office is considered, in the opinion of many deeply versed in liturgical subjects, as in perfect harmony with primitive usage, and as complete as any composition, not divinely inspired, can be.[4] And it is probable, that this consideration, combined with a knowledge of some other circumstances peculiar to the

[1] Mr Daubeny's Appendix to the *Guide to the Church*, Vol. II. p. 414. London, 1799.

[2] See above, Vol. I. p. 418.

Against the Armenians, who put no water into the chalice, but offered wine only, the 32d canon of the *Quin-Sextine* Council, or Synod of *Trullus*, quotes the Liturgies of *St James* and *St Bazil*, and the 37th canon of the African code, which direct wine, mixed with water, to be offered in the Eucharist.

In the Rubric of King Edward's first English Liturgy, it was directed, that the wine should be mixed with "a little pure and clean water." This direction, however, was omitted in the service revised in 1551.

[3] Vide *Lutheri formam Missæ*, &c. as above, p. 337.

[4] The use of this office, however, is not required, as an article of union, of those clergymen who received ordination from English or Irish bishops; nor is it universally used in this Church:

condition of Episcopacy in Scotland, produced that honourable testimony which was borne to it by the late learned and pious Bishop of Norwich, and expressed in the following terms:—"That if the great apostle of the Gentiles were upon earth, and it were put to his choice with what denomination of Christians he would communicate, the preference would probably be given to the Episcopalians of Scotland." [1]

Praise is ever valuable, in proportion to the judgment and character of him that bestows it. Such commendation, therefore, of this religious society, from such a man as Bishop Horne, is truly "*laudari a laudato viro*;" is no small compensation, in the opinion of its members, for all the obloquy that has been cast upon it by its adversaries, whose cry, for many years, seems to have been, "down with it, down with it, even to the ground."

I shall only observe further, under this head, that the pious and commendable practice of having public prayers on saint's days, and on Wed-

and it is doubtless a matter of serious regret, that in so small a society, there should not be unanimity and uniformity in the most solemn act of Christian worship.

It may also be remarked here, that those clergymen who use the Scotch Office, have no objections to the *English Communion Office*, which would hinder them from joining in the use of it in any part of England or Ireland.

[1] Mr Jones's *Life of Bishop Horne*, p. 151.—This Church also found a warm and faithful friend in the late Bishop Horsley, whose name I certainly did not mean to overlook in recounting the worthies of the *United Church of England and Ireland*, whereof it is well known that he was one of the most learned and distinguished prelates.

nesdays and Fridays, throughout the year, long prevailed in this Church, at least in large towns. It is devoutly to be wished, that this practice were to become more general, and that, where it is still continued, those members of the church whose circumstances and situations in life are such as to allow them to avail themselves of it, would shew their grateful sense of the advantages to be derived from it, by a regular attendance at the public service on those occasions, and particularly during the holy season of Lent;—a season, which, of all others, is usually spent, in this country, and particularly in this metropolis, in frivolity, festivity, and public amusements. When they contemplate the perilous situation of their forefathers and predecessors, their warmest gratitude is doubtless due to Heaven, that they now live in an age when the public profession of their religion does not involve them in personal danger, nor subject them to the confiscation of property. They stand on the peaceful shore, and view in the retrospect of former ages, the storms which agitated the members of their church upon a sea of troubles.

Compared with their circumstances of difficulty and distress, they themselves, though they enjoy not the advantages of a liberal establishment, are now blessed with perfect tranquillity, and religious freedom. Still, however, theirs is not a state of sloth and inactivity. They have duties to perform, less hazardous and painful indeed, but not less obligatory, nor less connected with their eternal interests. They enjoy a free tolera-

tion, and are now protected, in the open profession of their religion, by the laws of their country. They know who has said, that "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required;"—be it their task then, to avail themselves of the blessings which they now enjoy,—to let their light shine before men, that others may see their good examples,—and to shew the soundness of their principles by the integrity and consistency of their conduct.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.—The members of this Church are, in the strictest sense of the word, Episcopalians; and the government of their church is a Diocesan Episcopacy. Their distinguishing tenet, under this head, may be said to be—the apostolical institution and divine right of Episcopacy; and the necessity of Episcopal ordination, or, of a divine commission conveyed from the apostles, to preach the gospel, and to the valid administration of the sacraments.

This subject seems to have furnished the chief ground of contention between the two parties here, for upwards of a century after the Reformation in this country, during which time, there was no external badge of distinction between them, in faith, in worship, or in discipline;[1] nor did they break off communion with each other till about the year 1666.[2]

[1] See Mr Skinner's *Eccles. History of Scotland*, Vol. II. pp. 467-8.

[2] The first book, or treatise, that recommended the separation

The Scottish Episcopalians now retain all the essence of Episcopacy, without its modern appendages; and, while they maintain the independency of the church upon the state, in the exercise of those powers which are purely spiritual, they do by no means deny the propriety or the utility of a national establishment of religion.

Contrary to the opinion of the Presbyterians, that all ministers are co-ordinal and equal, they believe that, ever since the days of the apostles, there has existed another and higher class, to which the Presbyters have always been indebted for their authority, and responsible for their conduct; and, that the priesthood of the New Testament, as well as of the Old, is by succession.

No member of this Church, they tell us, need have any doubt as to the regular ordination of her ministers, for those of them that are ordained in Scotland, have their orders in a lineal course of succession from those Scottish bishops who were duly consecrated in England after the Restoration; and the Church of England had her orders by the same continued uninterrupted line through the primitive church, which led up at last to the apostles, and so terminated in the commission which they received from Christ, just before his ascension into Heaven. [1]

of Presbyterians from the public reformed worship under the Episcopal constitution in this church, seems to have been one entitled, *The Apologetical Relation of the Church of Scotland*, which appeared in 1664.

[1] Even the Romanists admit the validity of the ordinations

They believe that the Church of Christ is not a *sect*, but a *society*; in other words, that it is made up of a set of men, not merely professing the same Christian faith, but likewise united together by certain particular laws, and under a particular form of government;—that all the benefits of Christ's death are appropriated, and all God's promises of mercy and grace to mankind are made, to them that are in the church. And, they insist that their opinions respecting the nature and constitution of the church, and the consequent necessity of church communion, however unfashionable in the present day, are primitive and apostolical.

In regard to discipline;—King James VI. proposed five articles, which were adopted in the General Assembly holden at Perth in 1618, and hence called the *Five Articles of Perth*. They referred to, and recommended---*baptism in private houses—communion to the sick—kneeling at the communion—confirmation*—and *the observation of Christmas day, Good Friday, Easter-day, Ascension-day,* and *Whitsunday*. These articles were annulled in 1638, but were restored with Episcopacy in 1662; and again finally abrogated in 1690.—

of the Church of England to the Reformation, as derived by St. Austin from St. Gregory. And, for her ordinations since that period, see F. Courayer's *Defence of the Validity of English Ordinations*, translated by Williams;—Bishop Burnet's *Vindication of Ordinations of the Church of England*;—or, Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Englished by Lindsey.

In 1743, a set of canons, sixteen in number,[1] was drawn up, and these continue to be the standard of the discipline of this Church to the present day; for, though her governors and clergy have adopted the articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, and may approve her canons and system of discipline, it cannot be said that they have adopted them, or that their practice is the same with hers, in regard to church discipline, the difference and peculiarity of their situation leaving, on this head, but little room for conformity and practical agreement.

Anciently, the title of *Archbishop* was unknown in Scotland, but one of the bishops had a precedency, under the title of *Primus*, or *Maximus Scotiæ Episcopus.*[2] The country was afterwards divided into two archbishoprics, viz. *St Andrews* and *Glasgow*, and twelve bishoprics; and soon after the Revolution, the bishops dropping the title of archbishop, reassumed the old form, one of them being elected *Primus*, without respect either to seniority of consecration, or to precedency of district, with power of convocating and presiding, according to the above canons.

[1] They may be seen in the 2d vol. of Mr Skinner's *Eccles. History*, Letter 59.

[2] When King Kenneth (Macalpine) obtained his decisive victory over the Picts, he translated the Episcopal See from Abernethy to Kilremont, which he ordered to be called St Andrews, and the Bishop of it to be styled *Maximus Scotorum Episcopus.*

The first Archbishop in Scotland was Patrick Graham, who was created Archbishop of St Andrews in 1468, in the reign of James

Agreeably to the same likewise, every bishop is usually elected by the whole body of the clergy, within the diocese or district over which he is to preside; and they meet for such election in virtue of a mandate signed by at least a majority of the bishops. When the election is over, the issue of it is reported by the dean of the diocese to the *Primus*, who communicates it to his colleagues; and they, if a majority of them approve the election, jointly appoint a day and place for the consecration of the person elected, which is always performed by three bishops at least, in a public chapel, according to the ordinal of the Church of England.[1]

Though the districts, into which the bishops have now divided their church, are not exactly according to the limits of the dioceses under the legal establishment of Episcopacy, yet they still retain the names by which they were formerly distinguished, with the exception of *Fife*, instead of St Andrews. Every diocesan bishop has his distinct charge, and without claiming any legal title to his diocese, or assuming any other local

[1] *The Form and Manner of Ordaining Ministers, and Consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, used in the Church of Scotland*, was published in Edinburgh in 4to, A. D. 1620, and may be seen in the Advocates' Library here.

I have not yet compared this form with that now before me, used by Bishop Rattray, though, I believe, never printed; nor with the Ordinal of the Church of England.—There are no doubt, however, sufficient reasons for preferring this last to either of the other two.

or temporal jurisdiction, than what was acknowledged in the primitive church for the first three centuries, may as properly be denominated bishop of the place or charge assigned to him, as St James has always been called Bishop of *Jerusalem*, Ignatius, Bishop of *Antioch*, or Cyprian, Bishop of *Carthage*.—

On this footing, the Episcopal College in Scotland consists at present of the following members:

The Right Rev. John Skinner, Bishop of Aberdeen, and *Primus*.

The Right Rev. Andrew M'Farlane, Bishop of Ross.

The Right Rev. Dr William Abernethy Drummond, Bishop of Glasgow.

The Right Rev. Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray.

The Right Rev. Dr Daniel Sandford, Bishop of Edinburgh.

The Right Rev. Patrick Torry, Bishop of Dunkeld.

The Right Rev. Dr George Gleig, Bishop of Brechin.

Thus does there still exist in Scotland a church as well constituted, and perhaps as near the primitive pattern as any at this day in the world;—a church scriptural in her doctrine, apostolical in her government, primitive and pious in her worship, and decent in her ceremonies;—a church that has the scriptures of truth, the ancient and orthodox creeds, together with the two sacraments

administered after the decency and solemnity of the purest times;—a church, in short, that is redeemed from superstition and idolatry, defended from vanity and enthusiasm, and governed by men who, though not distinguished by titles, and honours, and riches, yet possess all the essentials of their order. For, as an ancient father remarks, "wherever there is a" (regular and orthodox) "bishop, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, at Alexandria or Tunis," and, it may be added, in England or Scotland, "ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii:"[1]—he is a bishop to all intents and purposes, as far as the existence, the spiritual wants, and the due government of the church are concerned.

See *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated from modern misrepresentation, with a Defence of Episcopacy, particularly that of Scotland,* &c. by Bishop Skinner, 8vo. 1803.

Numbers, Eminent Men, &c.—The Episcopalians are, I believe, the only society of dissenters from the establishment in Scotland, that has as yet been recognized by law; and they have ever been most numerous on the East coast of Scotland, and particularly in the county of Aberdeen. There are now about sixty congregations in the communion of their church, and about the same number of clergy, of all orders;[2] and the number

[1] Hieron. *ad Evagrium.*

[2] Pluralities and non-residence are unknown to this society,

of Episcopalians in Scotland, including the eight or nine congregations, that have not yet returned, together with their pastors, unto the bosom of the church, perhaps does not exceed 25,000; "a *little little* flock"[1] indeed, it must doubtless be acknowledged. But though they are not numerous, it will not be denied that they are highly respectable; for, in this number they can rank many of the most distinguished both of the nobility and gentry, who avail themselves of the act of parliament lately passed in favour of this Church, and cordially join in her communion. Yet, in no quarter of the country do her members seem to be increasing in proportion to what might be expected, from the well known attachment of the higher orders in Scotland to Episcopacy, and under the privileges which they now enjoy.

A state of tranquillity, and comparative prosperity, is the soil most favourable for literary eminence; it could therefore have been no just ground of reproach to this Church, had she been unable to point to any of her sons or servants who had arrived at high attainments in learning. But, notwithstanding her fluctuating fortune, and under all the disadvantages arising from her frequently depressed condition, she can produce a

and to every other denomination of Christians in Scotland.—Even the bishops here, as in Sweden, are each of them the pastor of a congregation.

[1] So would some render St Luke, xii. 32. Our translation of that text does not seem to convey the full force of the diminutive sense (if I may so say) of the original.

very respectable list of learned names, among which may be ranked those of Archbishop *Spotswood*, author of an *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, in folio;—Bishop *Forbes* of Aberdeen, author of two Theological vols. folio, written in Latin;—the truly evangelical Archbishop *Leighton*;—Bishop *Wishart*, of Edinburgh, the biographer of the Marquis of Montrose;—Bishop *Keith*, the historian and antiquary;—Bishop *Guthry*, author of the *Memoirs*;—the unaffectedly good and pious *Henry Scougal*, author of the *Life of God in the Soul of Man*, &c.;—the Hon. Bishop *Campbell*, author of *The Doctrine of the Middle or Intermediate State of Departed Souls*, &c.;—Bishop *Sage*, author of the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, &c.;—Bishop *Rattray*, author of *The Christian Covenant*, and editor of *St James's Liturgy* in Greek, collated with other ancient Liturgies, and freed from interpolations; a most learned specimen of theological criticism.[1]

And to these may now be added, the name of her late historian, the Reverend *John Skinner*, the learned and venerable parent of the present *Primus*;—a man of no common genius, nor of ordinary professional attainments, and who, doubtless, was one of the best Latin poets that Scotland

[1] See the title of this work at full length above, p. 43. Note. See also the account which is given of several Scottish bishops, by Bishop Burnet, (who was himself a member of this Church, and for some time Professor of Divinity at Glasgow,) in the Preface to his *Life of Bishop Bedell*.

can boast of since the days of Buchanan. If this man had received a more liberal education, and had his situation in life been less remote from literary society, his talents would have been more generally useful and respected, and his name, ere now, more widely extended.—But,

> "Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
> The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear;
> Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness in the desert air." [1]

These are only a few of the learned names that might be produced from a long list of those that are departed hence in the Lord, and "whose works have followed them."—And here I cannot refrain from dropping a tear to the memory of a faithful and valuable friend, lately deceased—the Right Rev. *Jonathan Watson*, Bishop of Dunkeld, who, called hence in the midst of his days, exchanged the mitre for the crown, on 28th June, 1808. [2] He, good man, never ventured to pub-

[1] Mr Skinner died in May 1807, at the advanced age of 86; and those who respect his talents and character, will be glad to learn that his *Posthumous Works* are now preparing for the press, and will soon be published by subscription, in 2 vols. 8vo.

[2] Of this pious and worthy man, whom I had the happiness of knowing almost from my childhood, and to whose instructions and fatherly counsels I am much indebted, I now say what M. *Formey* said of M. *Reinbeck*, viz. that he was "Theologien qui avoit toutes les vertus de son état, sans qu' elles fussent obscurcies par le moindre défaut, qu' on me permette ce mot sur un homme respectable, dont je chérirai toujours la memoire."

lish any work, great or small; but that now presented to the public, having been submitted to his inspection in MS., was much improved by his suggestions and remarks. And, for the outlines of this article, the author was indebted to a worthy and respectable Presbyter of this Church, a man of character and disposition congenial to those of the late Bishop of Dunkeld, and who is now very deservedly raised to his see and chair. But delicacy forbids my pointing out the virtues of this his successor, and also prevents my here naming any of the living authors of this Church. Their works, some of which are referred to above, speak for themselves, and must convince their impartial readers, that however little encouragement she can hold out to literary merit, she is by no means barren of such merit, but may still claim the honour that is due to genius, taste, and learning.

Nor can it be expected that I should presume to give any character of her clergy in general; suffice it to say, that their education is not worse, and that in several instances it is even better, than what the clergy of the establishment usually receive; and that some of them might do credit to any church. And that, as a body, they are, or ought to be, men of distinguished learning, piety, and worth, will be admitted by every reader who is aware that they are always liable to be decimated for the Episcopate: for, though the bishops of this Church be but just lifted above their clergy by the powers essential to their order,

yet, as says an ancient bishop and father—"nihil est in hoc sæculo *excellentius* sacerdotibus, *sublimius* episcopis, si nomen congruat actioni, et actio respondeat nomini."[1]

[1] D. Amb. *De dignit. Sacerdot.*

THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

RISE, PROGRESS, &c.—While arms and arts find their way into remote regions of the earth—while trade penetrates, with inconceivable assiduity, the secret recesses of inhospitable shores, and traces the footsteps of the savage inhabitants of the forest, we are happy to remark an extension also of religious benefits. And, among the circumstances favourable to the Protestant religion, which resulted from the troubles in England in the 17th century, was doubtless the colonization of several large districts in North America. As the different sides were predominant, such of the oppressed party as were peaceably inclined, emigrated at different times to that distant Continent, and there planted a number of Protestant societies, which have almost uniformly per-

severed in the systems of their ancestors, to the present day. While the American provinces were subject to Great Britain, the members of the Church of England made so small a proportion of their inhabitants, that it was found difficult to establish Episcopacy in that country; and though the whole body of the clergy, and many of the lay members of that communion, had long and anxiously desired, and earnestly requested, to have resident bishops among them, their superiors in England did not see fit to grant their request. But, after the convulsions of a destructive war, the declaration of independence in civil and religious rights "dissolved the established connexion which had hitherto subsisted between the Episcopal people in America, and the bishop of London, who had always been, by appointment and practice, the proper ordinary of the Episcopal Church there, but could no longer now be submitted to by them in that character. And as the United States had found it for their interest to grant an universal liberty of conscience to all professions, without preference to any by way of establishment, the Episcopal clergy, thus left to themselves, and destitute of any superior, began to look about how to get this fundamental defect removed, and have their new orphan church duly organized, in such a form as they believed essential to her being, and might find consistent with the civil constitution of their new government."[1]

[1] Mr Skinner's *Eccles. History of Scotland*, Vol. II. p. 684.

"In this important undertaking, the clergy of the province of Connecticut, who had long been a numerous body, took the lead, and having pitched upon *Dr Samuel Seabury*, one of the missionaries from the *Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, and who had been one of the suffering loyalists during the late war, they sent him over to England, with proper attestations of his character and qualifications, and earnestly supplicated the bishops there, to take pity upon their desolate state, and give them a bishop in the person of that worthy brother.

"Upon the Doctor's arrival in England, and presenting his credentials, the English prelates received him very graciously, but required time to consider in what way the object of his journey might be best accomplished. The business was new, and out of the usual line of their procedure hitherto, in the performance of this distinguishing part of their high office. They saw the expediency of the measure proposed, but wished to have some preliminaries adjusted, and brought as near as possible to their own stated forms, without which, they were at a loss how to act consistently with that regard which they owed to the standing practice of their church, and the strict connection subsisting in England between the civil and ecclesiastical constitution."[1]

This state of suspense necessarily lasting many months, the candidate began to weary of so long

[1] *Ibid.* p. 685.

a delay and uncertainty; and, knowing that there was a continued succession of bishops in Scotland, to the validity of whose Episcopal powers there was no objection, he found means to inquire what prospect there might be of speedy success from an application to that quarter, should such an application be formally and duly made. On its first intimation, the Scottish bishops hesitated; but when the proposal was more directly and earnestly repeated, and assurance given them, by authority on which they could rely, that Dr Seabury was a clergyman of unblemished reputation, and eminent parts, with a full representation, at the same time, how matters stood respecting him in England, they at last agreed to comply with the application; and he was consecrated bishop, at Aberdeen, on the 14th Nov. 1784, by Bishop *Kilgour*, then *Primus*, Bishop *Petrie*, and Bishop *Skinner*.[1]

Thus has the Episcopal Church in Scotland the honour of introducing the first resident Protestant bishop into America; and the Episcopal clergy of Connecticut, grateful for the signal favour thus done them, express an earnest wish, in their address to their new bishop on his return to America, "that wherever the American Episcopal

[1] "In 1793, Bishop Seabury published at New York two volumes of Discourses, which are such as might have brought credit to any prelate, in any age, and in any country."—He died in February 1796; and for a character of him, see p. 556 of Mr Boucher's work, referred to below, p. 450, and also the Obituary of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May 1797, p. 442.

Church shall be mentioned in the world, this also, that the bishops of Scotland have done for her, may be spoken of for a memorial of them."

In consequence of Dr Seabury's application, an act of the British parliament was passed, in 1786, to "empower the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Archbishop of York, for the time being, to consecrate to the office of a bishop, persons being subjects or citizens of countries out of his majesty's dominions."[1] The alleged obstacles in Dr Seabury's case being thus purposely and legally removed, another body of Episcopal clergy, in some of the southern States of the American Union, made a similar application to the English bishops; and on the 4th of February 1787, Drs *White* and *Provost*, the former elected for *Philadelphia*, and the latter for *New York*,[2] were consecrated at Lambeth, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough.

The Episcopal Church of America is therefore now completely organized with all proper officers to continue her existence;—with bishops duly authorized to perform all the original and essential

[1] The act itself, together with the correspondence of the English bishops, on this subject, with the General Convention of this Church, may be seen in the Journals of its proceedings, in Mr Knox's work, referred to below, p. 452.

[2] From the proceedings of the General Convention held at *Wilmington*, in the State of Delaware, on the 11th October, 1806, it appears, that *Dr David Griffith* also was elected for *Virginia*; but I do not find that he was consecrated at the same time with the other two.

duties of their office;—and, with a constitution, like that of the present Episcopal Church in Scotland, formed upon the model of the primitive church, antecedent to the time when the civil powers undertook to patronize it, being unconnected with any civil establishment.[1]

DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND WORSHIP.—The English Liturgy was revised, and proposed to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, at a Convention of the said church, in the States of *New York*, *New Jersey*, *Pennsylvania*, *Delaware*, *Maryland*, *Virginia*, and *South Carolina*, held at Philadelphia, from September 27th, to October 7th, 1785. This first edition of the American Liturgy adopted the alterations of our Book of Common Prayer, which had been proposed in 1689, by several excellent and eminent divines, acting under a commission of government for that purpose, when the object of the commission failed, and the civil authority has not since thought proper to revive the work by any new commission.[2] The alterations thus made and adopted by the American clergy, materially affect but few points of faith, doctrine, or discipline, and are chiefly confined to such circum-

[1] See "*A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution*," in 13 discourses, preached in North America, between the years 1763 and 1775, with an *Historical Preface* by Jonathan Boucher, A.M. and F.A.S., the late learned and respectable vicar of Epsom, Surrey.

[2] See above, p. 371.

stances of language or arrangement, as time and local situation appeared to render necessary. The prayers for *the King and Royal Family* are omitted, and prayers adapted to the government of the United States inserted. The articles of the Church of England are reduced to *twenty*; the *Athanasian Creed*, and the article of our Saviour's *descent into Hell*, in the Apostle's Creed, together with the office for the *Thanksgiving of women after child-birth*, the *Commination*, &c., are left out; some alterations are made in the *Burial Service*; most of the proper lessons are changed, selections only of the reading and singing Psalms are used, and various other abridgments adopted.

In the second edition of their Liturgy, which took place soon after, and which was ratified in Convention on the 16th of October 1789, the *Nicene Creed*, the article of our Saviour's *descent into hell* in the *Apostles' Creed*, the office for *the Thanksgiving of women after child-birth*, together with the Psalms in order, &c., are restored, chiefly in compliance with the wishes of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, expressed in their letter to the *Committee* of the *General Convention* at Philadelphia, of date June 1786. So that their book of Common Prayer now differs less than formerly from that of the Church of England, except that this latter edition has adopted *the Oblation* and *Invocation* in the Communion Service, whereby it approaches nearer to the *Scotch Communion Office*, and the Liturgies of

the primitive church.[1] In the preface to this edition of their Liturgy, the American bishops and clergy tell us, that they are far from intending to depart from the Church of England "in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require." They retain the "Form of Prayer for the visitation of Prisoners," and the "Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the fruits of the earth, and all the other blessings of his merciful providence," to be used yearly, on the first Thursday in November, which were introduced into the first edition.[2]

In the Convention in 1789, various resolutions passed for the government and good order of the Episcopal Church in the United States; and several Conventions have been held since, as in September 1795, and in June 1799.

See the *Journals of the American Convention appointed to frame an Ecclesiastical Constitution, and prepare a Liturgy for the Episcopal Churches in the United States*, in a work entitled, *Observations upon the Liturgy, with a proposal for its Reform*, &c. By a *Layman of the Church of England*, (Mr Knox) *late an Under Secretary of State*, 8vo. Printed for J. Debrett, 1789.[3]

[1] In the General Convention held at *Wilmington*, 11th October, 1786, the *Nicene Creed* was unanimously restored, and the *Athanasian* Creed rejected, by a majority of 17 to 3.

[2] This *American Liturgy* was printed in London for J. Debrett, opposite Burlington House, Piccadilly.

[3] We are told, (in the *Public Characters*, Vol. II. p. 250)

NUMBERS, &c.—From a journal of the proceedings of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Convention in Philadelphia, 1799, it appears, that the number of the Episcopal clergy in the United States at that time was *seven* bishops, and 211 Presbyters. The number of Episcopal congregations in several of the States, is nearly as follows:—In Connecticut, 52;—New Jersey, 25;—Massachusetts, 16;—Delaware, 14;—New Hampshire, 3—District of Maine, 2. The Episcopalians and Quakers compose about one-third of the inhabitants of Pennsylvania, and Episcopacy is found to prevail more or less in all the other states.

This Church has an University and an Academy at Philadelphia, a College at Washington, &c. And it appears that she admits of Pluralities, of which there are sixteen in Connecticut alone.

The denomination of Methodists in the United States, style themselves "The United Societies of the *Methodist Episcopal Church;*" and the Moravians in Pennsylvania call themselves the "United Brethren of the *Protestant Episcopal Church;*" but I presume there is no connection between either of these societies and the Episcopal Church which forms the subject of this article.

See Mr Fuller's edition of Hannah Adams's *View of Religions.*

that "The Episcopal Church in America was founded upon a system recommended by Mr Grenville Sharp."

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

the primitive church.[1] In the preface to this edition of their Liturgy, the American bishops and clergy tell us, that they are far from intending to depart from the Church of England "in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require." They retain the "Form of Prayer for the visitation of Prisoners," and the "Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the fruits of the earth, and all the other blessings of his merciful providence," to be used yearly, on the first Thursday in November, which were introduced into the first edition.[2]

In the Convention in 1789, various resolutions passed for the government and good order of the Episcopal Church in the United States; and several Conventions have been held since, as in September 1795, and in June 1799.

See the *Journals of the American Convention appointed to frame an Ecclesiastical Constitution, and prepare a Liturgy for the Episcopal Churches in the United States*, in a work entitled, *Observations upon the Liturgy, with a proposal for its Reform*, &c. By a *Layman of the Church of England*, (Mr Knox) *late an Under Secretary of State*, 8vo. Printed for J. Debrett, 1789.[3]

[1] In the General Convention held at *Wilmington*, 11th October, 1786, the *Nicene Creed* was unanimously restored, and the *Athanasian* Creed rejected, by a majority of 17 to 3.

[2] This *American Liturgy* was printed in London for J. Debrett, opposite Burlington House, Piccadilly.

[3] We are told, (in the *Public Characters*, Vol. II. p. 250)

NUMBERS, &c.—From a journal of the proceedings of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Convention in Philadelphia, 1799, it appears, that the number of the Episcopal clergy in the United States at that time was *seven* bishops, and 211 Presbyters. The number of Episcopal congregations in several of the States, is nearly as follows:—In Connecticut, 52;—New Jersey, 25;—Massachusetts, 16;—Delaware, 14;—New Hampshire, 3—District of Maine, 2. The Episcopalians and Quakers compose about one-third of the inhabitants of Pennsylvania, and Episcopacy is found to prevail more or less in all the other states.

This Church has an University and an Academy at Philadelphia, a College at Washington, &c. And it appears that she admits of Pluralities, of which there are sixteen in Connecticut alone.

The denomination of Methodists in the United States, style themselves "The United Societies of the *Methodist Episcopal Church*;" and the Moravians in Pennsylvania call themselves the "United Brethren of the *Protestant Episcopal Church*;" but I presume there is no connection between either of these societies and the Episcopal Church which forms the subject of this article.

See Mr Fuller's edition of Hannah Adams's *View of Religions*.

that "The Episcopal Church in America was founded upon a system recommended by Mr Grenville Sharp."

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by James Ballantyne & Co.